	K3DKBRI1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 19 CR 521 (PKC)
5	PETER BRIGHT,
6 7	Defendant. Trial
8	New York, N.Y. March 13, 2020 10:05 a.m.
10	Before:
11	
12	HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL,
13	District Judge -and a Jury-
14	APPEARANCES
15 16 17 18	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: MICHAEL D. MAIMIN ALEXANDER LI Assistant United States Attorneys
19	DAVID E. PATTON Federal Defenders of New York, Inc. Attorney for Defendant
20	BY: AMY GALLICCHIO ZAWADI S. BAHARANYI
21	Assistant Federal Defenders
22	Also Present: Elizabeth Jensen, FBI Ariella Fetman, Government Paralegal Alondra Reyes, Defense Paralegal
24	
25	

K3DKBRI1

(In open court; jury present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, before we begin, what I'm going to say has nothing whatsoever to do with the specifics of this trial, but I can't let this morning go by without again complimenting you on your diligence in serving, serving at a time when I know there are other things on your mind. This is a trial that is taking place while conditions and advice are changing with regard to the COVID-19 circumstance.

I will just simply say, we're going to get to a period of time when the weather will be even nicer, and your jury service may be a distant recollection to you. It may be at a family barbecue or a picnic -- yes, we'll have picnics and family barbecues -- and I don't want you ever to be mean to anyone, but it may come up that someone says to you that they evaded jury service, and I want you to think back on your own service because you know how important it truly is to all parties involved in a trial.

So I'll leave it at that, ladies and gentlemen, and we'll get back to the business at hand.

Mr. Bright, the Court reminds you that you are still under oath.

Whenever you're ready, Ms. Gallicchio.

- 1 PETER BRIGHT, resumed.
- 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED
- 3 BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
- 4 Q. Good morning, Mr. Bright.
- 5 A. Good morning.

9

- Q. So, Mr. Bright, before you went to the meeting on May 22nd,
- 7 | 2019, with Liz, had you told anyone about your plan?
- 8 A. No. I didn't really feel I had anyone who I could tell.
 - Q. What about your wife? Why didn't you tell your wife?
- 10 A. So, polyamory -- my relationship with my wife is
- 11 polyamorous. Polyamory isn't something you just choose on the
- 12 | spur of the moment. We had many months of kind of negotiation
- 13 and discussion between ourselves and with our couples therapist
- 14 about how we would handle the relationship because there are
- 15 | lots of questions that wouldn't otherwise arise, like how much
- 16 do you tell your partner about other partners, about your
- 17 | dating, about your sex life.
- And we had decided that, for the most part, our sex
- 19 | lives would be kept private; we didn't need to share those kind
- 20 of details. This was doubly so for kink. My wife is vanilla;
- 21 she had no interest in kinky sex. She understood that I did,
- 22 | and that I wanted to satisfy these desires, but she wanted to
- 23 | play no part in it, she didn't want to hear the details, she
- 24 wasn't very excited to hear the kinds of things I was into
- 25 except at a very high level.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

RI1 Bright - Direct

So, while, in some ways, she would seem the obvious person to turn to and talk to, I felt that would be -- doing so would be breaking the terms of our marriage. It would be bringing her into my kinky world, in my other relationships, in a way that I felt would trample what we had worked so hard to build.

- Q. Were you at all concerned about your safety when you went to the meeting on May 22nd?
- A. No.
- 10 | Q. Why didn't you go to the police right away?
- 11 A. I thought about that, but I -- the evidence, such as it

 12 was, was the chat log on my phone, and I felt very

 13 uncomfortable giving this to the police for a few reasons.
- 14 knew that the police, or FBI, or whoever, would want to take a
- 15 | forensic copy of my phone. I know that's what they do. They
- do it for phones that are in evidence; they do it even for
- 17 witnesses and others. This is the sort of standard process
- 18 they do to get information from the phone.
- 19 Q. How do you know that?
- 20 A. My colleagues have written about it, and I have -- in my
- 21 | job at the British library, I worked in -- I wasn't working
- 22 with law enforcement, but I was working with data recovery
- 23 companies who sometimes offered services to law enforcement.
- 24 So I became broadly familiar with extracting data from
- 25 electronic devices and some of the techniques used.

- Q. By the way, do you have the equipment to do that at home?
- A. No.

- Q. Go ahead. You can continue.
- A. So, yeah, I thought, well, what if I give them my phone for the chat log? I didn't want to do that.

I think there probably, I would say, three big reasons. First of all, the chat log itself, while, to me, it was very clear that we were talking about age play up until it became clear that we weren't, I felt that it was liable to be misinterpreted by a layperson. I know the world of kink is not everyone's world, I know the world of age play is not everyone's world, and parts of the chat log, for example, about the — Alicia, or the purported 11-year-old, in the Bronx could be very easily misinterpreted in a way that would cause me a great deal of trouble.

The second reason: I sext a lot. I'm on many dating apps. Many people entrust me with their personal information, their naked pictures, the exciting and/or dirty details of their sex lives, and this is not information that I felt comfortable sharing with anyone. It was entrusted to me.

The third reason is: Again, I have friends who trust me, and some of -- well, one friend, in particular, has told me about certain criminal activities she is involved with, and it incriminates both herself and a very senior, very well-known politician, and I didn't feel comfortable in the slightest

- 1 | letting law enforcement have this.
- 2 | Q. You were interviewed by Agent Spivack and Agent Adamczyk;
- 3 | is that right?
- 4 A. Right.
- 5 | Q. You saw portions of your interview --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . -- in this trial?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Can you just describe how you felt during the interview with the FBI agents?
- 11 A. Well, they bore -- they proved some of my fears correct.
- 12 | They were -- they didn't know what I was talking about when it
- 13 | came to age play. They were very hostile. They didn't seem
- 14 | very interested in anything I had to say. A number of times,
- 15 | they shouted at me.
- One agent would ask a question, and then the other
- 17 | agent would immediately interrupt and not even let me give a
- 18 | full answer. I think, at one point, one of the agents sort of
- 19 bangs their pen on the desk in sort of frustration or anger.
- 20 | O. Now --
- 21 THE COURT: Wait, wait. The question was: How
- 22 | did you feel?
- 23 THE WITNESS: Okay. So I felt threatened. I felt
- 24 | like the -- like nothing I could say would ever be the right
- 25 answer for them. I felt -- I certainly felt I can't trust

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

They lied to me repeatedly. I felt I can't -- I certainly can't entrust them with anything that would be sensitive or confidential.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Could we play, for the witness and the jury, Government Exhibit 9, clip 1. And just the -- I'll tell you when to stop.

(Video playback)

- BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
- Do you recall that exchange with the FBI agents?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 And what was your reaction to that communication?
- 12 THE COURT: Refine your question, if you will, please.
- 13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Sure. Sorry.
- 14 How did you feel during that exchange? Q.
- 15 Α. I felt like they didn't have a clue. I felt they had no 16 understanding of the world I was in. Yeah --
- 17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Can we play --
- 18 Q. I'm sorry.
- 19 Yeah, I felt they were complete outsiders.
- 20 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'd like to play, this time, clip 8.
- 21 (Video playback)
- 22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you.
- 23 BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
- 24 Mr. Bright, how were you feeling during that exchange?
- 25 Again, it reinforced they -- we were almost speaking

K3DKBRI1

Bright - Direct

different things. They knew nothing about -- I mean, even more broadly, asking, well, if your role player is a 14-year-old, wouldn't a 14-year-old be the same? It's not that they didn't understand age play; they don't understand sexual role playing at all. I don't think they understand any kind of role playing at all. It sounds like they don't understand acting. It felt like we were on a completely different planet.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, there's an instruction I want to give you at this juncture.

There is no legal requirement that law enforcement agents investigate crimes in a particular way or that the government prove its case through any particular means. While you are to carefully consider the law enforcement evidence introduced by the government, you are not to speculate as to why they used the techniques they did or why they did not use other techniques. The government is not on trial. Law enforcement techniques are not your concern. Your concern will be to determine whether, on the evidence or lack of evidence, the government has proven the defendant's guilt by proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Next question.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Your Honor, may I note my objection?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you.

- 1 BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
- 2 | Q. Now, Mr. Bright, Agent Spivack asked you why couldn't you
- 3 go to the police or the FBI and say, here's my chats, here's my
- 4 | phone, and you said you didn't think of that?
- 5 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recall that clip that was played earlier?
- 7 A. Yes.

6

8

9

- Q. Or yesterday?
 - Why did you say that? First of all, was that the
- 10 | truth?
- 11 A. No. That was a lie.
- 12 | Q. Why did you say that?
- 13 A. To protect my friends in particular. At this point, I knew
- 14 | they had the chat log, and I knew they were using it to try to
- 15 | incriminate me, but if I told them the truth, if I said I
- 16 didn't want to hand over my phone because it has stuff on it
- 17 | that incriminates other people, then I would be signaling them
- 18 | to directly look on my phone for this stuff, look on my phone,
- 19 | and you will find stuff that incriminates other people in other
- 20 crimes. So I couldn't say that, because that would be painting
- 21 | a big target on my friends. So I said, no, I didn't think of
- 22 that.
- 23 \parallel Q. Did you lie to the FBI about anything else?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 | Q. Now, when you went to the meeting, you indicated that you

- 1 | were planning to record it?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- Q. Can you just describe what your plan was and how you
- 4 | carried it out?
- 5 A. My plan was -- well, what I wanted to get was (a) some
- 6 concrete information from Liz, like where she lived, her
- 7 | address; and, (b) for Liz to make some positively incriminating
- 8 statement. So not using the euphemism she had been using
- 9 | before, not leaving it all a little ambiguous for her to say
- 10 something that was unambiguously inviting me to hurt the kids.
- 11 So, I used the -- android has a sound recording
- 12 | program for taking voice notes, that kind of thing. So I
- 13 started that recording and switched out of the app, it carries
- 14 on recording even in the background, and went to the meet where
- 15 | Liz would be.
- 16 | Q. When did you start the recording?
- 17 A. I started the recording shortly before -- I think I was on
- 18 the subway riding to the station to meet her.
- 19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Can we play Government Exhibit 6B
- 20 | through F, but we'll start with 6B.
- 21 (Audio playback)
- 22 BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
- 23 | Q. Mr. Bright, can you explain why you were making this
- 24 | commentary?
- 25 A. To kind of contextualize the recording. It was an audio

- recording, so I wanted to sort of explain what was going on. I
 was also trying to explain, like, some of my thoughts and
 thinking as I went to the meet.
 - Q. Did you have a script with you?
- 5 | A. No.

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

- Q. When you say, "I think it's amazing," what do you mean by that?
 - A. I mean, it's -- I was amazed, it's stunning, it's extraordinary, it's -- I mean, you read about child molesters and things in the newspaper, online, but it's not a mother just sort of pimping her kids on the internet. That's -- I was shocked by that. It was unthinkable.
 - MS. GALLICCHIO: Could we play Government Exhibit 6C, please.
- 15 (Audio playback)
- 16 BY MS. GALLICCHIO:
 - Q. Mr. Bright, where are you at this point when you're making this comment?
- 19 A. At the park. Duane Park, I think it is.
- 20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Play Government Exhibit 6D.
- 21 (Audio playback)
- 22 | Q. Mr. Bright, can you explain what you were meaning by that?
- A. As I said yesterday, I thought there was a chance that Liz
 was some kind of internet vigilante. So I thought it was quite
- 25 possible we were going to this meeting with the idea of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

catching the other person, which I thought would have been quite funny, and I figured we would compare notes, like compare techniques, talk about their story, my story, and go our separate ways.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Can we play Government Exhibit 6E. (Audio playback)

BY MS. GALLICCHIO:

- Q. Mr. Bright, explain your comment.
- A. So the first part, I had actually tried to -- instead of using the audio app, I tried using the camera video app, but I discovered when you turn the screen off, that app stops recording, so I had to stick to the audio app. Video would have been nicer, obviously.

Then the second part, when I say it's remarkable, it's, again, my complete astonishment at who this person was purporting to be and what she was apparently doing.

MS. GALLICCHIO: If we could play Government Exhibit 6F.

(Audio playback)

MS. GALLICCHIO: Ms. Reyes, if we could just display the transcript of 6F. Leave that on the screen.

BY MS. GALLICCHIO:

- Q. So, Mr. Bright, I want to break this down into a couple of areas.
- 25 You first comment: "26 minutes, where on earth is

7

9

476

1 | she?" What do you mean by that?

- 2 A. So I'd been waiting in the park quite some time, and that
- 3 was frustrating. I wanted to meet her at a particular time
- 4 | because I knew that would be a time when the kids weren't
- 5 | there. And we were getting later and later to when the kids
- 6 were expected back from school, which I didn't really want.
 - Q. And then you say: "Beginning to think I'm being stood up"?
- 8 A. Yeah, I thought she might not turn up at all.
 - Q. Now, you write: "Typing." What are you meaning by that?
- 10 A. I was looking at the WhatsApp conversation at the time, and
- 11 WhatsApp gives you an indication when the person on the other
- 12 | end is typing a message, but before you see their message, so
- 13 when I said "Typing," she was writing me a message.
- 14 | Q. And then you say: "What do you have to say for yourself
- 15 | pedo-mum?" Can you describe what you mean by "pedo-mum"?
- 16 | A. It's kind of a disparaging riff on Princessmom because she
- 17 seemed to be a pedophile.
- 18 Q. What does "pedo" mean?
- 19 A. Pedo is short for pedophile.
- 20 | Q. Then you say: "Okay, ten more seconds." What are you
- 21 referring to there?
- 22 | A. I'm not sure. I think that must be the message she finally
- 23 sent me on WhatsApp.
- MS. GALLICCHIO: If we could take a look at Government
- 25 | Exhibit 3A, page 132.

- 1 THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah.
- BY MS. GALLICCHIO: 2
- 3 Q. Let's just take a look at all of those boxes. The top box,
- 4 Mr. Bright, is on 5/22 at 2:18. You say: "I'm at the park."
- 5 Right?
- 6 Α. Right.
- 7 What park are you referring to?
- 8 Α. Duane Park.
- 9 Then you get a message from Liz at 2:20:55, which says:
- 10 "Okay, give me a few minutes. I'm trying to get back. LOL. Ι
- 11 was literally in the dressing room!!"
- You respond: "LOL. Okay." 12
- And then at 2:47:01, Liz writes: "Ten seconds. 13 Just
- 14 getting on Hudson."
- 15 Α. So that must be the ten seconds I was referring to.
- Were you looking at your phone while you were recording? 16
- 17 Yes. Α.
- 18 Q. Did you --
- 19 MS. GALLICCHIO: We can take that down.
- 20 Did you take screenshots of Liz's profile? Ο.
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. Why did you do that?
- 23 I figured that would be something that I could also hand
- 24 over with the recording to show where I'm at and how she was
- 25 advertising.

- Q. Now, on the phone call between you and Liz, she asked you to bring a printout of your STD test results, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Did you?
- 5 A. I did not, no.
- 6 \mathbb{Q} . Why not?
- 7 A. Because I wasn't there to have sex with anyone. I was
- 8 | there to record her incriminating herself and to leave. So why
- 9 | would I need to print out my test results?
- 10 | Q. So when you got to the meeting, did Liz ask you for the
- 11 | test results?
- 12 A. She did, yes.
- 13 | Q. Did you have them at the ready?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 | Q. What did you do to produce them?
- 16 A. I spent several minutes searching for them on my phone, to
- 17 get the website up that I'd shown her previously. In fact, she
- 18 even had to prompt me to help me find them because I was
- 19 struggling to find them.
- 20 | Q. Prompt you with what?
- 21 | A. She told me, I think, the date that they were from. I
- 22 | think she said it was May the 4th or something like that.
- 23 Q. Now, when you were arrested, did you tell the police you
- 24 were recording the interaction with Liz?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. Did you tell them what you were doing?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Did you agree to speak with them?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. Did you give them consent to search your phone?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 \parallel Q. Did you give them consent to go to your apartment and
- 8 | take -- and search your desktop computer?
- 9 A. So I think, technically, I gave them consent to seize and
- 10 search my computer. I don't know if I actually gave them
- 11 consent to enter the apartment, but, to me, that was implied.
- 12 | But I know for law enforcement, you need to be very particular
- 13 about these things.
- 14 | Q. Did you give consent to search your Google account?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. All of your emails?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Your Google searches?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And why? Why did you do all of those things?
- 21 A. Because I was an innocent guy here. I was trying to stop a
- 22 | bad person. I felt I had nothing to hide.
- 23 | Q. Now, Mr. Bright, do you possess any child pornography?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 | Q. Do you exchange any child pornography?

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross

- 1 A. No.
- 2 | Q. Do you search for any child pornography?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 | Q. Do you have any interest in child pornography?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Did you at any time have any intention to entice a minor to
- 7 | engage in sexual activity?
- 8 A. No, never.
- 9 | Q. Did you at any time have any intention to have sexual
- 10 contact with a seven and nine-year-old?
- 11 | A. No.
- 12 | Q. Are you sexually attracted to a seven and nine-year-old?
- 13 | A. No.
- 14 | Q. Are you sexually attracted to children?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 | Q. When you showed up at the meeting with Liz, were you hoping
- 17 | to have sexual contact with a seven and nine-year-old?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 MS. GALLICCHIO: I have no further questions, your
- 20 Honor.
- 21 | THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
- 22 You may cross-examine.
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 | BY MR. LI:

25

Q. Mr. Bright, your user name on KinkD is Randomanon, correct?

K3DKBRI1

Bright - Cross

- 1 Α. Yes.
- In April of 2019, you reached out on KinkD to someone you 2
- 3 later knew as Liz, correct?
- 4 Yes. Α.
- 5 At some point, she told you she was a mom, right?
- 6 I don't believe she ever said that. Α.
- 7 At some point, she told you she had two children, right?
- I don't believe she ever said that either. 8 Α.
- 9 At some point, she told you she had kids, right?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 Q. She told you the names of her kids, right?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 They were Kayla and Braydon, right?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- 15 Q. She told you that Kayla was seven, correct?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 She told you that Braydon was nine, correct? Q.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 Now, you exchanged some messages with the mother on KinkD,
- 20 right?
- 21 The purported mother, yes. Α.
- 22 You gave her your phone number, right? Q.
- 23 Yes. Α.
- 24 And that phone number was (832)907-0710, right?
- 25 Α. Yes.

- Q. You used that phone number to chat with her on WhatsApp, correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. You also got the mother's phone number, right?
- 5 A. Yeah, I expect so, yes.
- 6 Q. You exchanged some messages on WhatsApp with her, right?
- 7 A. Quite a few, yes.
- 8 Q. You exchanged some photographs with her, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.

11

12

- 10 Q. At some point, you also spoke with her on the phone,

correct?

- 13 Q. Did you also say anything --
- 14 THE COURT: Whoa, whoa, whoa.

I heard her voice, yes.

- The question was: At some point, you also spoke with her on the phone, correct?
- THE WITNESS: I don't strictly remember if it was a

 telephone call made over the telephone network or a WhatsApp

 call made through the WhatsApp app. The effect is the

 same you speak to the other person in realtime, but I just

 don't remember specifically the technology that was being used.
- 22 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 23 | BY MR. LI:
- Q. When you spoke with the mother in that conversation you just described, you personally used a phone, correct?

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. At some point after that, you met with the mother in person
- 3 here in Manhattan, right?
- 4 A. The purported mother, yes.
- 5 | Q. And that was in Duane Park, correct?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Your Gmail address is drpizza@gmail.com?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And your Twitter handle is @drpizza?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. You said on direct examination that you are not sexually
- 12 | attracted to children, correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. You do enjoy DDLG, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 \parallel Q. And DDLG is a form of age play?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. DDLG stands for Daddy Dom/Little Girl?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Now, your preference is to be the daddy, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. So that means someone else normally plays the little girl,
- 23 || right?
- 24 A. Or little boy, but, yes.
- 25 | Q. DDLG involves a little girl, right?

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Now, your ideal little girl is 11 or maybe 12, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. DDLG is a fantasy you enjoy, right?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So another way of saying that is you like the idea of
- 7 sexual activity with an adult who is pretending to be an
- 8 | 11-year-old girl, correct?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Now, DDLG is a consensual activity, right?
- 11 A. Very much so, yes.
- 12 | Q. And it requires a lot of trust between partners?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. It requires a lot of knowledge between partners?
- 15 A. I would say so, yes.
- 16 | O. Boundaries have to be discussed?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Expectations have to be set?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. One reason for this is DDLG is a sexual activity?
- 21 A. Often, yes.
- 22 | Q. And it's important to make sure that everyone's on the same
- 23 page before any sexual activity occurs?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Now, on direct examination, you described some of the

- 1 | language that you've heard in age play.
- 2 | A. Yes.

- Q. Do you remember that?
- And I think you testified that some of those words are mommy, and princess, and prince, correct?
- 6 A. Among many others, yes.
- 7 Q. Those words help maintain the fantasy, right?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. They help maintain the fantasy because it's language that
- 10 | might be used with children?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. It's language appropriate for the age, right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. It also means that those words are sometimes used outside
- 15 of the age-play context, correct?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. In fact, mommy is a word of common usage?
- 18 A. On the KinkD app, mommy has a very particular meaning that
- 19 | is not the common usage, and nobody on the app would be using
- 20 | it in its common usage.
- 21 | Q. I understand. But --
- 22 A. It has usage in other contexts that is different from the
- 23 one on KinkD, yes.
- 24 | Q. I understand what you're saying, but please just answer the
- 25 | question I'm asking.

- So the question is: Mommy is a word of common usage, correct?
 - A. Yes.

3

4

- Q. When someone says mommy, sometimes they mean mother, right?
- A. Depending on context, yes.
- 6 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's pull up Government
- 7 Exhibits 1 and 12 side by side, please. And for Government
- 8 Exhibit 12, let's turn to the second page, please.
- 9 BY MR. LI:
- 10 | Q. Government Exhibit 1 is the mother's KinkD profile, right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And Government Exhibit 12 is your KinkD profile, right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Now, in your KinkD profile, you selected, as one of your
- 15 | roles, age player, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And in the mother's KinkD profile, she selected the role
- 18 mommy, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. She did not select age player, correct?
- 21 A. Not explicitly, but mommy is a subset of age player.
- 22 | Q. In the my role selection in Government Exhibit 1, we do not
- 23 see the words age player, correct?
- 24 A. I don't see those words, no.
- MR. LI: Now, if we could zoom out of Government

- 1 | Exhibit 1, please, Ms. Fetman.
- 2 Q. Do you see the text of the my self-summary section where it
- 3 | says, "Looking for a teacher to teach my kids about the birds
- 4 and the bees"?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. The words "my kids" are in here, correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. She doesn't use the word littles, right?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. She doesn't say the words age play, correct?
- 11 A. There are many words she doesn't say, yes.
- 12 | Q. She doesn't say the words role play, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 | Q. In fact, you found her profile a bit unusual because it
- 15 | suggested to you that other people might be involved, right?
- 16 A. Yeah. Most age play tends to be -- what is the word
- 17 Dr. Cantor used -- dyads, so one-on-one. The prospect of
- 18 | having a threesome or a foursome was relatively unusual, yes.
- 19 | Q. So your experience with DDLG is normally one-on-one, right?
- 20 A. Mostly, yes.
- 21 | Q. So this idea of having three or four people involved was
- 22 | unusual to you, right?
- 23 A. Not unheard of, but not the norm.
- 24 | Q. To be clear, isn't it true that you never had a
- 25 conversation with a mother in which you explicitly discussed

age play?

- A. We never used that specific word, but you don't need to 2 3 have that specific word.
- 4 Isn't it true that you never had a conversation with the
- 5 mother in which she explicitly said her children were actually
- adults? 6
- 7 That's true.
- Isn't it true that you never had a conversation with her in 8
- 9 which you explicitly asked whether her children were actually
- 10 adults?
- 11 In the same way that I didn't ask if they were human, yes.
- 12 You testified about the 11-year-old that you spoke with on
- 13 the mother in the chats. Do you recall that?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- 15 MS. GALLICCHIO: I am going to object to the continued 16 use of the word "mother."
- 17 THE COURT: The jury has been here for the trial.
- 18 They understand the use of the word in some contexts can mean
- 19 the purported mother, or a person pretending to be a mother, or
- 20 a mother. I think that's what this trial has been about.
- 21 There is no evidence here that the individual with whom the
- 22 defendant was communicating is, in fact, a mother. The only
- 23 testimony in the trial is that that individual is not a mother.
- 24 So I'm not grasping the import of the objection.
- 25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I was just referring to the word

- "mother" itself. That's not how it was ever referred to in any
 of the communications.
- 3 THE COURT: All right. Overruled.
- 4 Go ahead.
- 5 BY MR. LI:
- 6 Q. Mr. Bright, will you understand me if I use the word
- 7 | "mother" to refer to the person with whom you communicated, the
- 8 person who you knew as Liz?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Now, you testified about the 11-year-old that you spoke
- 11 | with in the chats with the mother earlier. Do you recall that?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And you said she was a 30-something person age playing as
- 14 | an 11-year-old. Do you recall that?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Isn't it true that you never had a conversation with the
- 17 | mother in which you explicitly told her that the 11-year-old
- 18 was doing DDLG?
- 19 A. Yeah, I guess.
- 20 | Q. You've had age-play relationships with adults in the past,
- 21 | right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. One of those adults was Stevie?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And you met with Stevie in person?

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Now, before you met with Stevie, you exchanged text
- 3 messages with him, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. You had a discussion with Stevie about DDLG?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Now, DDLG is not a term of common usage, right?
- 8 A. I suppose, yes.
- 9 Q. DDLG is specific to age playing?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. In fact, you used the age-play specific term DDLG with
- 12 | Stevie, right?
- 13 A. Correct. Because Stevie, I met on a vanilla site, so there
- 14 was no implication of kink. There was no assumption of this
- 15 | shared interest.
- 16 Q. You used the exact term DDLG with Stevie, correct?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. You also had an explicit discussion with Stevie about your
- 19 | usual DDLG fantasy, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And that's a fantasy involving an 11 to 12-year-old girl,
- 22 || right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. You described that to Stevie specifically as a fantasy,
- 25 | correct?

- 1 A. Yes. I was trying to invite Stevie into my fantasy, yes.
- 2 | Q. And you used the word "fantasy"?
- 3 A. Probably, yes.
- 4 Q. Do you recall whether you used it?
- 5 A. I don't know if I said fantasy, or scenario, or scene,
- 6 or -- you know, there are many words with the same kind of
- 7 | meaning. I don't remember which specific word I used, but --
- 8 Q. Sure.
- 9 Is there anything that will help you remember whether 10 you used the word "fantasy"?
- 11 A. I could look at the defense exhibits, but they're not up
 12 here.
- 13 | 0. Sure.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, could you please pull up Defense
- 15 | Exhibit I just for identification and turn to page 8, please.
- 16 | Q. Take a look and let me know when you're done.
- MR. LI: I'm sorry. Let's turn to page 7, please.
- 18 Q. I apologize.
- 19 A. Oh, yes.
- $20 \parallel 0$. The last --
- 21 A. I describe it as a fantasy rather than a scene or scenario,
- 22 but, yes.
- 23 | Q. Do you now remember whether you used the word "fantasy"?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- MR. LI: We can take this down, please.

K3DKBRI1

Bright - Cross

- 1 Did you use the word "fantasy" with Stevie?
- 2 Α. Yes.
- 3 You also had a discussion with Stevie about DDLB, right?
- 4 Yes. Α.
- 5 DDLB stands for Daddy Dom/Little Boy?
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 DDLB is not a term of common usage, right?
- 8 Α. No.
- 9 DDLB is specific to age playing? Q.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And isn't it true that you used the age-play specific term
- 12 DDLB with Stevie?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. So you agree that with Stevie, you used the explicit
- age-play terms DDLG and DDLB, correct? 15
- A. Yes. 16
- 17 Another one of your prior DDLG relationships was with
- 18 Denesy, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 And you chatted with Denesy?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- Q. You had a discussion with Denesy about DDLG, correct? 22
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 And in your conversation with Denesy, you, again, used the
- 25 specific age-play term DDLG, right?

context.

Bright - Cross

- A. Yeah. Again, because we met on a vanilla site, and so we had to establish that shared interest and establish that
- Q. Did you use the word "DDLG" -- excuse me. Did you use the term "DDLG" with Denesy?
- 6 A. I just said yes.
- Q. Isn't it true that in your 769 chat messages with the mother, you never once used the age-play term "DDLG"?
- 9 | A. Yes.

3

- Q. Isn't it true in that your 769 chat messages with the mother, you never once used the age-play term "DDLB"?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- Q. Isn't it true that in your 769 chat messages with the mother, you never said specifically that your plan with her children was a fantasy?
- 16 A. I mean, it was abundantly clear from words like teacher and
 17 lessons, but I don't think I ever said the word fantasy, no.
- 18 Q. So you agree you never said the word "fantasy"?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. Isn't it true that in your phone call with the mother, you never said the terms DDLG or DDLB or used the word fantasy?
- 22 A. Yes.

- 23 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's pull up Government 24 Exhibit 3A, please, and let's turn to page 23.
 - Q. Do you see a message here where it says, "Got any family

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross

- 1 | photos"?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You sent this message from your phone, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You sent this on May 15th, 2019, correct?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And this was before you had the phone call with the mother,
- 8 | right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And this was before you received any pictures from the
- 11 mother, right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 THE COURT: And, again, so there's no confusion here,
- 14 when you used that term, you're referring to Liz, the person
- 15 | with whom he was communicating? Is that accurate?
- 16 MR. LI: That is accurate, your Honor.
- 17 | THE COURT: All right. Then I think you should use
- 18 | the word Liz --
- 19 MR. LI: Of course, your Honor.
- 20 | THE COURT: -- going forward.
- 21 | BY MR. LI:
- 22 | Q. You claim that you believe the children were actually
- 23 adults when you said, "Got any family photos," right?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Let's turn to page 49, please.

- 1 | Q. Do you see a message that says: "Cool. Let them handle
- 2 | it. See how it pulls back, et cetera"?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And you sent it to Liz, right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. You sent it from your phone?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And you sent it on May 16th, 2019, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And this was, again, before you had the phone call with
- 13 | Liz, right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. So, this was also when you believed the children were
- 16 | actually adults, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. The "it" you're referring to in this message is your
- 19 | foreskin, correct?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And the "them" you're referring to in this message is Kayla
- 22 and Braydon, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And Kayla and Braydon were the names that Liz had given you
- 25 | for her purported children, correct?

- 1 At the time, I thought they were purported littles, but, 2 yes.
- 3 Q. Sure. People you believed at the time were adults,
- 4 correct?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- So at the time you sent this message, you sent this to --6 7 in regards to people who you thought were adults?
 - A. Yes.

8

22

- 9 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, we can not blow this up. 10 you.
- 11 Q. You testified on direct examination that at some point, 12 some of the things that Liz said seemed to be a bit strange; is 13
- 14 A. Yes.

that right?

- 15 Q. Fair to say you started to see some red flags?
- 16 I think that is a word that has been used, that I have 17 agreed to, but it's not a word I have introduced, I think.
- 18 Would you agree that you started to see red flags?
- 19 I don't think they were -- any of the individual things on 20 their own, I think, would be innocuous, but when I looked back 21 at them in their totality, then I could describe them as red
- 23 So, at some point, you started to see red flags, right?
- 24 Α. In retrospect, yes.

flags.

25 You began to become concerned that she might be talking

- 1 | about actual kids, correct?
- 2 A. Among other options, yes.
- Q. And in retrospect, one of those red flags was your call
- 4 | with Liz, correct?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And even then, you thought it was a bit strange that she
- 7 was talking about taking her kids to the playground, right?
- 8 A. Yeah, that level of play is a little more than I would
- 9 normally do. I am familiar with nonsexual age play, I have
- 10 participated in nonsexual age play, but when I'm on a dating
- 11 app, I'm mainly looking for the sexual stuff. So it was a
- 12 | little outside what I would be ideally looking for.
- 13 | Q. Mr. Bright, I'm just going to ask you to please listen to
- 14 | the question I'm asking you and please try to answer the
- 15 | question.
- 16 The question is: Even then, during the call with the
- 17 | mother -- with Liz, excuse me, you thought it was a little bit
- 18 strange that she was talking about taking her kids to the park;
- 19 | isn't that correct?
- 20 A. To repeat, yes.
- 21 | Q. You also were concerned because the mother had alluded to
- 22 | being molested, right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. That set off alarm bells for you, right?
- 25 A. In retrospect. You know, it seemed strange at the time,

- 1 but in retrospect, when I looked at it together, it was more 2 than just strange, it was a red flag, I think is the word you 3 used.
 - MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's turn to page 57, please, of Government Exhibit 3A.
- 6 So, here on, we'll just blow up the top two bubbles, 7 please, Ms. Fetman.
 - So, here, on May 17, 2019, at 4:13 p.m., Liz writes:
- 9 "Great chatting with you!" Do you see that?
- 10 A. Yes.

4

5

8

- 11 And you respond: "And you!," correct?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 So this was the time, approximately, that you had your call with Liz, right? 14
- 15 This was, I think, immediately after the call, yes. Α.
- So this was immediately after things began to seem a little 16 17 bit strange?
- 18 A. Strange, but I hadn't put them together and realized that 19 there was something sinister going on.
 - But it began to seem a little bit strange, right?
- 21 Yes, but no more than strange.
- 22 MR. LI: Let's turn to page 68, please. Let's blow up 23 the top message on the left, please.
- 24 Q. Do you see the message where it says: "I think things like 25 an excess of back-to-back orgasms need a certain level of

K3DKBRI1 Bright - Cross maturity, too"? Do you see that? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 You sent that message to Liz, right? 4 Α. Yes. 5 And you sent this on May 17th, 2019, correct? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And that was the same day as your call with Liz, right? 8 Α. Yes. 9 You sent the message at 6:34 p.m., correct? Q. 10 Α. Yes. 11 So a couple of hours and change after your call, correct? 12 Α. Yes. 13 So when you sent this message, it was after things had Q. 14 started to seem strange, right? 15 A. Yes. But no more than strange. 16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Let's turn to page 69, please. Let's 17 blow up the first four messages, please. 18 (Continued on next page) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

- 1 BY MR. LI:
- 2 | Q. Do you see here a message that says: "Some girls at a very
- 3 | early age discover that it feels good to rub certain bits."
- 4 Do you see that?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You sent that message, right?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. And you sent it to Liz, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And you sent this on May 17th, 2019 at, 6:43 p.m., correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And that's, again, just a few hours after your call with
- 13 | Liz, correct?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. So that's after things had begun to seem strange, correct?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Do you see where it continues: "But otherwise help her
- 18 discover that herself, touching or vibrating her clit, putting
- 19 | a finger inside or maybe a very tiny toy."
- 20 Do you see that?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. You sent that message as well, right?
- 23 | A. I did, yes.
- 24 | Q. And you sent that on the same day, which was May 17th,
- 25 | 2019, correct?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And you sent that at 6:46 p.m., correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And, again, that was after things had become strange?
- 5 A. Yes, but no more than strange. Not yet sinister.
- 6 Q. Do you see where it continues: "How to hold my snake,
- showing her where the most sensitive parts of it are, the parts
- 8 | that feel best to lick or rub."
- 9 Do you see that message?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And you sent to it the mother -- excuse me, to Liz,
- 14 | correct?
- 15 A. To Liz, yes.
- 16 | Q. And you sent that on the same day as your phone call with
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you sent that a few hours after your phone call with
- 20 | Liz, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Do you see the fourth message here where it says: "How to
- 23 | keep it in her hand and the kind of motion that feel good?"
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. You sent that message as well, correct?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And you sent that on May 17th, 2019?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And that was the same day as your call with Liz?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 | Q. And so this was also after things had become strange, yes?
- 7 A. But not yet sinister.
- 8 MR. LI: Let's turn to page 70, please. We'll pull up 9 the first message.
- 10 | BY MR. LI:
- 11 | Q. Do you see where it says "Is Kayla a virgin?"
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. You wrote that message, correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. And you sent that to Liz, right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And you sent that on May 17th, 2019, at 8:15 p.m., correct?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. So that's about four hours after your call with Liz, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And this is after things had started to seem strange,
- 22 || right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- Q. And this evening is when you had started to really think
- 25 about the strangeness of it, correct?

- A. There were things she said, I think, after this that also seemed strange. And it was after that I started to put things together.
 - THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last words you said.
 - THE WITNESS: It was after that I started to put things together.
- 8 THE COURT: Thank you.
 - MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, can we zoom out, please? Let's zoom in on the last two messages, please.
- 11 | BY MR. LI:

4

5

6

7

9

10

- 12 Q. You see where it says: "Yes, but I think the tip might be
- all I can manage." Do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. You sent this message, right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. And the tip you're referring to in this message is the tip
- 18 of your penis, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. You sent this message on May 17th, 2019, at 8:30 p.m.,
- 21 | correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. So this was about four hours and change after your phone
- 24 | call with Liz, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. And that was after things started to seem strange?
- 2 A. But no more than strange. Indeed, one of the next things
- 3 | that seemed strange was shortly after this message.
- 4 | Q. All right. Let's get to that. So the next message on this
- 5 page is: "How old were you when you first took a whole cock?"
- 6 Do you see that message?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And you sent it the same evening as all the other messages
- 11 | that we've just been discussing, right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And let's look at the response to that.
- MR. LI: Can we blow up the green bubble on the right,
- 15 | please?
- 16 | BY MR. LI:
- 17 | Q. So Liz responds to your message, right?
- 18 A. Yes. She alluded to being molested again.
- 19 Q. So she said: "I was nine but wasn't eased into it at all,"
- 20 || right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. So you saw that message, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And at this point it had been nagging at you because of
- 25 something that Liz had said on the phone call, right?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. She had alluded to being molested on the phone call, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And that was bothering you?
- 5 A. It seemed like an unusual thing to say, yes.
- Q. And you wanted to know whether this was fantasy or if it
- 7 was real, right?
- 8 A. Yes. It sort of -- it stepped beyond what I would consider
- 9 | tasteful for fantasy. It's definitely a thing that people
- 10 | fantasize about but it's not a thing that I fantasize about.
- 11 | Q. So it had occurred to you at this point that maybe she was
- 12 | real, right?
- 13 A. Among other things.
- 14 | Q. And one of the reasons you asked her the question was
- 15 | because you wanted to figure out if she was real or just
- 16 | fantasy, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And so her response is: "I was nine but wasn't eased into
- 19 | it at all." And that response suggested to you that she might
- 20 be real, right?
- 21 A. Among other things, yes.
- 22 | Q. And at that point, you began to wonder if maybe this wasn't
- 23 | age-play, right?
- 24 A. Among other things, yes.
- 25 | Q. You began to wonder --

- A. I still hadn't given it deep consideration. That came later.
- Q. At this point, you started to wonder if maybe there might
- 4 be real kids involved, right?
- 5 A. It still seemed like a remote possibility, but yes.
- 6 Q. But it was something you thought about, right?
 - A. Briefly.

7

8

- Q. So is it fair to say the alarm bells were starting to ring
- 9 a little louder now?
- 10 A. I would say -- I mean alarm bells sounds quite strong for
- 11 | me. I would say the alarm bells didn't really ring until the
- 12 | following day when I actually had time to think about it
- 13 | together and read back through the message and think about the
- 14 phone call. Because the rest of that evening I was quite
- 15 distracted because I was on a date. So it was nagging at the
- 16 | back of my mind but I didn't give it a ton of thought.
- 17 | Q. So are you saying that you did not view this as alarm
- 18 | bells?
- 19 A. In retrospect, yes.
- 20 | O. At the time.
- 21 | A. At the time, it was just another really odd, surprising
- 22 | strange thing that -- it gave me pause for thought. But an
- 23 | alarm bell sounds very strong to me and I don't think I would
- 24 have thought of it that strong.
- 25 | Q. So you testified yesterday on direct examination about this

- 1 | set of chats; do you recall that?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And you were asked some questions and you gave some
- 4 | answers; do you recall that?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And, of course, you were under oath yesterday just like you
- 7 | are today, right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And isn't it true that you --
- 10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Page, please.
- 11 MR. LI: Sure. This is yesterday's transcript, page
- 12 | 427.
- 13 | BY MR. LI:
- 14 | Q. You were under oath yesterday, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And your oath was to tell the truth, correct?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you swore to tell the truth when you took the stand,
- 19 || right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Isn't it true that when you were asked the following
- 22 | question, you gave the following answer:
- 23 | "Q. All right. So why did you ask her that question?
- 24 | "A. Something -- I think it was something she said on the
- 25 phone call that was nagging at the back of my mind. Like, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

- think she alluded to having been molested. And I was trying to learn more about that, because that wouldn't -- I mean, that's the kind of thing that sets off alarm bells. And so I wanted to further understand what it was that she was talking about.

 And like, you know: Is this something in the fantasy space or is this something that really happened to you? And it sounded like something that really happened to her, which is not the right thing, you know. It's -- it kind of threw me."
 - Isn't it true that when you were asked that question I read, that you gave the response I read?
 - A. Yes. I said it is the kind of thing that sets off alarm bells, but I did not say it set off an alarm bell and I did not say it set off an alarm bell at that time.
 - Q. So you agree that talking about being molested sets off -- is the kind of thing that sets off alarm bells, right?
- 16 A. Yes. But I didn't specify any kind of temporal constraint
 17 to that.
 - Q. And you agree that in the chats we were just looking at,
- 19 Liz talked about being molested, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- Q. So at that point, when Liz told that you she had been molested, you didn't call the cops, right?
- 23 | A. No.
- Q. At that point, you didn't try to get more information from
 Liz that evening, right?

- A. No. As I testified, this was before I really had thought that it was likely that she was a child molester.
- 3 Q. Sure. In fact, I think you just said that you had other
- 4 plans that evening, right?
- 5 | A. I did, yes.
- 6 Q. So instead of calling the cops or asking Liz for more
- 7 | information after you learned she had been molested, you went
- 8 on your date, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Now, when Liz sent you pictures of what appeared to be
- 11 | actual children, that was a turning point, right?
- 12 A. Yes. It made it seem that -- I mean, I still felt there
- 13 were possibilities. I felt she could have been a scammer, but,
- 14 yes, it was a big turning point.
- 15 | Q. It was a big turning point?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. So that's when things really clicked, right?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And when you got the pictures, you had a flurry of
- 20 | emotions, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. You were angry?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. You were disgusted?
- 25 A. Very much so, yes.

- 1 | Q. You were disappointed?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. But you kept going because you wanted to get evidence for
- 4 | law enforcement, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And you had no sexual interest in the chats after that
- 7 point, right?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. You were just concerned about the kids?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Now, you received the first three pictures of the purported
- 12 | children on May 19th, 2019, correct?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, please turn to page 75 of
- 15 || Government Exhibit 3A. If you could just focus on the middle
- 16 green bubble, please.
- 17 | BY MR. LI:
- 18 Q. Now, you received the first photograph of the purported
- 19 children at 5:27 p.m., correct?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And you saw the photograph after receiving it right?
- 22 A. I think so, yes.
- 23 | Q. It was a picture of Brayden, the boy, right?
- 24 A. Purported to be, yes.
- 25 | Q. The caption of the photograph says: Brayden watching TV,

- 1 || right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's zoom out please and blow up
- 4 | the last green bubble to the right.
- 5 BY MR. LI:
- 6 Q. You received the second photograph of the purported
- 7 | children at 5:28 p.m., correct?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. So that was about a minute after the first photograph,
- 10 | right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, could you please pull up
- 13 Government Exhibit 3N side by side.
- 14 | BY MR. LI:
- 15 | Q. Government Exhibit 3N on the right is the picture you
- 16 received, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you saw that picture?
- 19 A. I saw the thumbnail of it, yes.
- 20 | Q. It was a picture of Kayla, the girl, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And the picture clearly shows a child, right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. The caption of the photo says: "Kayla not listening to me
- 25 and playing with the phone, lol, "right?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And you saw that caption, correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And the mother had previously told you --
- 5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Objection.
- 6 MR. LI: Excuse me. Liz.
- 7 Let me restate the question.
- 8 BY MR. LI:
- 9 Q. Liz had previously told you that Kayla was seven years old, 10 right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And when you saw the picture, you realized that there might
- 13 be a real child involved, right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. It was pretty obvious from the photo, right?
- 16 \parallel A. It's obvious that the person in the photo is a child, yes.
- 17 | Q. Now, you say you're not sexually attracted to children,
- 18 || right?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 | Q. You testified yesterday that you are sexually attracted to
- 21 people who actually have the opposite physical characteristics
- 22 | as children, right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. You actually prefer your partners to be physically hairy,
- 25 || right?

- 1 A. Very much so, yes.
- 2 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's turn to page 76, please and
- 3 | blow up the first bubble on the left.
- 4 BY MR. LI:
- 5 Q. Now, you responded to the picture of Kayla at 5:29:09 p.m.,
- 6 correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. That's 20 seconds after you got the picture of Kayla,
- 9 | correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And at that time, you were shocked?
- 12 A. Among other things. I realized I had to do what I'd
- 13 previously decided and play along to get information from her.
- Q. At the time that you received the message from Kayla --
- 15 | excuse me.
- 16 At the time that you received the message from Liz
- 17 | with a picture of Kayla, you were shocked, right?
- 18 A. I just said yes.
- 19 | Q. You were angry, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. You were disappointed, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And in your flurry of shock, and anger, and disappointment,
- 24 | your response, 20 seconds later, was: "She looks like a
- 25 cutie, "right?

- 1 A. Yes, because I was playing along. Yes.
- 2 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's pull up the second green
- 3 bubble to the right here.
- 4 BY MR. LI:
- 5 | Q. You got a third picture of the purported children at 5:30
- 6 p.m., correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. And that was about two minutes after you got the first
- 9 photo, right?
- 10 A. I think so, yes.
- 11 | Q. In the picture it looks like the mother is between the
- 12 | thighs of al child, right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And the caption says: "Here's one before playtime," right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. You saw the picture after she -- you saw this picture,
- 17 | right?
- 18 A. I saw the thumbnail, yes.
- 19 Q. You saw the caption too, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And you responded to this message, correct?
- 22 A. Yes. At this point it seemed less likely that she was a
- 23 | scammer, and more likely that she was a child molester. And so
- 24 | I felt I had to continue to play along.
- 25 | Q. And at that time, since it seemed less likely she was a

- 1 scammer, you were really shocked, right?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. You were really angry now, right?
- 4 A. No. I wasn't -- I don't think I was any more angry.
- 5 | Maybe -- but maybe a little more angry. But I don't -- I can't
- 6 say I can precisely remember the exact levels of my emotions at
- 7 \parallel the time.
- 8 | Q. You were feeling strong emotions at the time, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. You responded to this photograph 27 seconds later, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Twenty-seven seconds later while you were shocked and angry
- and disappointed, you responded: "Oooh"?
- 14 | A. Oh.
- 15 Q. You responded: "Oh"?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. But then you wrote: "Playtime sounds fabulous?"
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You sent those two messages, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 MR. LI: Let's turn to page 77, please. Let's pull up
- 22 | the two blue bubbles on the left please.
- 23 | BY MR. LI:
- 24 | Q. Do you see where it says here: "Kissing her flower, I'm
- 25 | sure it's beautiful?"

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 3 A. Yes. It was a few minutes elapsed, but yes.
- 4 | Q. You sent that message to Liz, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And you sent it on May 19th, 2019, at 5:35 p.m., correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. That's five minutes after the last picture of the children
- 9 we just saw, correct?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And you sent this message in your whirlwind of confusion --
- 12 | excuse me -- of anger and disappointment, correct?
- 13 A. No. By this time, I was feeling a little more analytical.
- 14 | I had looked back at the previous messages. I can't say I
- 15 seemed very enthused about -- in terms of the messages I'd
- 16 | sent, they didn't seem very enthused. I felt I wasn't playing
- 17 | the part very well. So I sent this message to try to bolster
- 18 my credibility with Liz.
- 19 | Q. Did you just say that five minutes after getting that last
- 20 picture, you were no longer angry?
- 21 A. I don't think I said I was no longer angry at all. I said
- 22 | I was feeling a bit more analytical.
- 23 | Q. So you were still angry when you sent this message, right?
- 24 A. Somewhat.
- 25 | Q. You were still disappointed when you sent this message,

- 1 | right?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You were still shocked when you sent this message, right?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. And even though you were shocked and disappointed and
- 6 angry, you wrote: "Kissing her flower. I'm sure it's
- 7 | beautiful?"
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you see the next message where it says: "How big a boy
- 10 | is Brayden?"
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. You sent that message too, right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And you sent that on May 19th, 2019, at 5:43 p.m., correct?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. "Brayden" is the name of the purported son, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And Liz had told you he was nine years old, correct?
- 19 A. Yes. I was asking, trying to affirm that.
- 20 | Q. You sent this message after you realized Brayden might
- 21 really be a real child, right?
- 22 A. Yes. When I was putting my plan into action, yes.
- 23 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's zoom out of this and zoom
- 24 | in on the last blue bubble to the left.
- 25 BY MR. LI:

- 1 | Q. Do you see the message: "His manhood?"
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. And you sent it to Liz, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. You're referring here to a penis, right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Specifically you're referring to the penis of Brayden?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And that was someone who you thought might really be a
- 12 | nine-year-old boy?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. You sent this message on May 19th, 2019, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. 5:45 p.m.?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And this was just minutes after you had gotten the pictures
- 19 of Brayden and Kayla, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 MR. LI: Let's turn to page 79, please.
- 22 | BY MR. LI:
- 23 | Q. Do you see a small picture on the left?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. You sent that picture, right?

K3DLBRI2

Bright - Cross

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. It's a picture of your penis, right?
- 3 A. Right; in response to Liz asking how big it was.
- 4 | Q. It's your erect penis, right?
- 5 A. That's normally what people mean when they ask how big your
- 6 penis is, yes.
- 7 | Q. At some point you took that picture of your penis, right?
- 8 A. Some years ago, yes.
- 9 Q. And you sent it from your phone?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And you sent it to Liz?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And you sent this on May 19th, 2019, at 5:55 p.m., right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. And that was just minutes after you saw the pictures on
- 16 | Kayla and Brayden, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And that was after you thought they might be real children,
- 19 || right?
- 20 A. Yes. It's when I felt I had to play along with Liz, yes.
- 21 | Q. You were also worried that she might be a scammer, right?
- 22 A. I thought it was definitely possible, yes.
- 23 | Q. And even knowing that she might be a scammer, you sent her
- 24 a picture of your penis, right?
- 25 A. Yes. Why wouldn't I? I'm sorry.

- Q. And even knowing that she might be a child molester, you sent her a picture of your penis, right?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And then you follow up --
- 5 MR. LI: Can we blow up the next message, please.
- Q. You say: "I think it's a reasonable size, though far from
- 7 | huge, "right?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You sent that message on the same day, May 19th, at 5:55
- 10 | p.m., right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Again, this was on the same day just minutes after you got
- 13 | the pictures of Kayla and Brayden, correct?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Let's turn to page 90, please. Let's blow up
- 16 | the last blue bubble on the left.
- 17 | BY MR. LI:
- 18 | Q. Do you see where it says: "I must admit, I'd love to have
- 19 | more pictures of the three of you. The one with you kissing
- 20 | Kayla's thigh is thrilling. I only wish I could see what
- 21 | happens next?"
- 22 A. You yes.
- 23 | Q. You wrote that message, right?
- 24 A. I did. I felt that the pictures I had had little
- 25 evidentiary value because Liz's face is obscured in the picture

K3DLBRI2

- of her kissing Kayla's thigh. I was hoping to get something that was more incriminating.
- 3 Q. You sent this message to Liz, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. You sent this on May 20th, 2019?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And this was after you received the pictures of Kayla and
- 8 | Brayden, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 \parallel Q. And so this was after you thought they might be real
- 11 | children, right?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And so even knowing that Kayla might be a real
- 14 seven-year-old girl, you wrote: "I only wish I could see what
- 15 | happens next?"
- 16 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Let's turn to page 115 please. Let's blow up
- 18 the first picture on the right, please.
- 19 BY MR. LI:
- 20 | Q. Do you see the small picture shown here?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. That's another picture of Kayla, right?
- 23 A. Purported Kayla, yes.
- 24 Q. The picture clearly shows a child, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. The caption says: "Sleeping beauty" with a smiley face,
- 2 correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. You received this picture from Liz, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You got it on May 20th, 2019, right?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And you saw this picture after receiving it, right?
- 9 A. I saw the thumbnail.
- 10 | Q. And you saw the caption too, right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And you responded to the message, right?
- 13 A. Yes. I gave a pretty banal response, yes.
- 14 | Q. Sure. Why don't we pull up your response.
- You responded on May 20th, 2019, at 10:33 p.m. and two
- 16 | seconds, right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. That is less than 30 seconds after you got the picture,
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. I -- I think so. Can we see both together?
- 21 | Q. So the picture --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- was received -- I'm sorry. Why don't I rephrase the
- 24 question.
- 25 You responded to the picture of Kayla shown on this

- 1 page less than 30 seconds after you received it, correct?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And your response was: "What a cutie," correct?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's blow up the second picture
- 6 on the same page, please.
- 7 BY MR. LI:
- 8 Q. Now, you received a second photograph of Kayla on the same
- 9 day, right?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And you got that picture on May 20th, 2019 at 10:35 p.m.,
- 12 | correct?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. This picture also clearly shows a child, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And the caption says "Sweet dreams," right?
- 17 A. With three exclamation points, yes.
- 18 | Q. You received this message in this caption from Liz, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And you saw it, right?
- 21 | A. I saw the thumbnail, yes; and the caption, yes.
- 22 | Q. And you responded, correct?
- 23 \parallel A. I think so, yes.
- MR. LI: Why don't we go to the response, Ms. Fetman.
- 25 BY MR. LI:

- 1 | Q. You responded at 10:36 p.m., correct?
- 2 A. Yes; another fairly banal nonsexual response.
- 3 | Q. You responded less than a minute after you got the picture,
- 4 | correct?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And your response was: "Such delight," right?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And you sent this message after you thought that Kayla
- 9 | might be a real seven-year-old girl, correct?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Let's turn to page 102, please. Let's blow
- 12 up the second blue bubble to the left.
- 13 | BY MR. LI:
- 14 | Q. Do you see where it says: "At risk of sounding crude, I've
- 15 | been feeling unimaginably horny today and it has been
- 16 | phenomenally distracting?"
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. You sent that message, right?
- 19 | A. I did, yes.
- 20 | Q. You sent it to Liz, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And you sent this message on May 20th, 2019, at 4:52 p.m.,
- 23 || right?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You sent this message unprompted, right?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And you sent this message after you received the first set
- 3 of pictures of Kayla and Brayden, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You got those pictures on May 19th, 2019, the day before,
- 6 right?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. And so you sent this message after you realized Kayla and
- 9 Brayden might be real children, right?
- 10 A. Yes. I mean, I think I would say I'm fairly skilled and
- 11 | experienced in the art of sexting. That was a role I knew how
- 12 | to play. So I was playing that role.
- 13 | Q. So the answer to the question is yes?
- 14 A. To repeat myself, yes.
- 15 Q. Now, you claimed that your plan was to meet the mother --
- 16 excuse me.
- 17 You claimed your plan was to meet Liz on May 22nd to
- 18 catch her and report her to law enforcement, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And two days before your plan sting, you told Liz you were
- 21 worried she was a cop, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's turn to page 84.
- 24 | THE WITNESS: May I correct myself?
- I told her that I was worried that I would be met by a

K3DLBRI2

Bright - Cross

- cop. I don't think I explicitly said I was worried that she was a cop.
- 3 BY MR. LI:
- 4 | Q. So on May 20th, 2019, at 8 50 p.m., you wrote: "So my
- 5 concern is am I being set up here, " right?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And then you wrote: "I was struck by the fear yesterday
- 8 | that I'd be met by a cop or something, "correct?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. You wrote those messages to Liz, right?
- 11 A. Yes; to try to set her mind at ease.
- 12 | Q. This was all part of your effort to gather evidence, right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And this was in order to reassure Liz that you were not a
- 15 cop, right?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 | Q. Now, up until this point, you and Liz had not been talking
- 18 about the police, right?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 | Q. But it's your testimony here today that you wanted to
- 21 reduce her concern about the police by bringing up the police?
- 22 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, we can take down this exhibit.
- 24 | BY MR. LI:
- 25 | Q. You met Liz on May 22nd, 2019, right?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. When you met her, you were on assignment for work, right?
- 3 A. No; nor have I claimed to be.
- 4 | Q. You weren't writing an article?
- 5 A. No; nor I have claimed to be.
- 6 Q. You were there on your own?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. You were there to meet someone who you thought might be a
- 9 criminal?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Specifically, you thought she might be someone offering up
- 12 her kids for sex?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. You didn't tell your wife about the meeting?
- 15 A. I couldn't. But, no.
- 16 | Q. You didn't tell your editor about the meeting?
- 17 A. Why on earth would I tell my editor? No.
- 18 | Q. You didn't tell anybody about the meeting?
- 19 A. Didn't have anybody to tell.
- 20 | Q. You had met Liz in Duane Park, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. You went to a corner of the park, right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. You spoke with her for a few minutes?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. You showed her your STD test results on your phone?
- 2 A. Eventually, yes.
- 3 Q. You were recording the whole conversation, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. And you didn't actually want to meet the kids, right?
- 6 A. Correct, which is why I chose a time to meet before the
- 7 | kids were meant to be there.
- 8 Q. Your plan was to simply record Liz saying something
- 9 | incriminating, right?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. After you got that evidence, you could leave, right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, could you please play Government
- 14 | Exhibit 6G?
- 15 | THE COURT: All right. We're going to take a pause.
- 16 | This is a good point for a mid-morning break.
- 17 Please do not discuss the case among yourselves or
- 18 | with anyone. We'll be back in action in ten minutes.
- 19 (Jury not present)
- 20 | THE COURT: See you in ten minutes.
- 21 MR. MAIMIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- 22 (Recess)
- 23 (Jury present)
- 24 | THE COURT: Please be seated.
- 25 You may continue.

- 1 BY MR. LI:
- 2 Q. Before we broke, we were talking about your plan to meet
- 3 | with Liz; do you recall that?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. And you didn't actually want to meet with the kids, right?
- 6 A. Correct; hence the choice of time.
- 7 Q. Your plan was to record her saying something incriminating,
- 8 | correct?
- 9 A. Yes. Until that point, she had never been actually
- 10 sexually explicit. You know, she had never said, have sex with
- 11 | the kids, or anything along those lines. So I wanted to get
- 12 something that was more explicitly incriminating from her.
- 13 Q. I understand, Mr. Bright. Just for the sake of time, I'll
- 14 | ask you to just answer the questions that I ask you, please?
- MS. GALLICCHIO: Your Honor. He is answering them.
- 16 | THE COURT: Just put your next question to the witness
- 17 | please.
- 18 BY MR. LI:
- 19 Q. Your plan was to record Liz saying something explicitly
- 20 | incriminating, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. You wanted her to talk about sexual activity with the
- 23 | children so you could record it?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And once you had that incriminating evidence, you could

1 | leave?

2 | A. Yes.

3 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, please play Government Exhibit 6G

4 | from the timestamps 7:27 to 8:07. And please publish the

accompanying transcript, which is Government Exhibit 6, at page

6 nine.

5

7

(Audio recording played)

8 BY MR. LI:

- 9 Q. Mr. Bright, we just heard a portion of your meeting with
- 10 | Liz, right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And you recorded it?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. That's correct?
- 15 Now, during the meeting, she says: "Oh, you said
- 16 practicalities."
- Do you see that on line ten?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. And you responded, right?
- 20 A. Yes; to the practicalities, part.
- 21 | Q. Sure. So you're responding to the practicalities.
- 22 What you didn't say is: Yeah, let's talk about
- 23 practicalities. You did not say that, right?
- 24 A. No. I was expecting this conversation to occur in her
- 25 house. The park was busy. There were people within earshot

```
K3DLBRI2
                                 Bright - Cross
      all around. So maybe I'm wrong, but I did not expect someone
1
      to tell me about having sex with their kids in a public park,
 2
 3
      in a very public place.
 4
            (Continued on next page)
 5
6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

- 1 BY MR. LI:
- 2 | Q. Do you see, on lines 12 to 14, Liz says: "No. I know we
- 3 | talked a little bit about the stuff, like, um, like your kinks
- 4 and stuff, so I don't know"? Do you see that?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Now, you don't respond to that and say, oh, let's talk
- 7 | about the kinks and stuff; you don't say that, right?
- 8 A. Why would I say that we weren't talking about kinks. I
- 9 mean, kinks had no role in this at this point.
- 10 | Q. You don't say let's talk about what you want me to teach
- 11 | the kids, right?
- 12 | A. No. Again, that was going to happen in her home.
- 13 | Q. You don't say, at this point, let's talk about the lesson
- 14 | plan you want me to give, right?
- 15 A. No. Again, because that kind of explicit talk would not
- 16 occur on the street where the people could hear.
- 17 | Q. So you agree you didn't say any of those things?
- 18 A. The very first word I said was "No," so I'm agreeing with
- 19 you, yes.
- 20 | Q. After the conversation ended, you started walking with Liz
- 21 | to the house, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And you agree that on line 9, it says here, from Liz, "Oh,
- yeah, so they'll actually be home"?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. That's what it says, right?
- 2 A. It does, though I have no recollection of her saying that
- 3 | at the time. I think I heard the practicalities, and that
- 4 occupied all my thinking.
- 5 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, we can pull that down.
- 6 Q. You were arrested on May 22nd, 2019, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. I believe you testified on direct that you did not go to
- 9 | law enforcement before then because you did not want to provide
- 10 your phone. Did I get that right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Before going to the meeting, you knew you had some evidence
- 13 on your phone, right?
- 14 A. Pretty marginal. Yeah, there's nothing explicit. There's
- 15 | no -- she didn't send me any child pornography, she didn't
- 16 | explicitly invite me to have sex with her kids. I didn't think
- 17 | it had very much evidential value. I thought it was more
- 18 | incriminating to me than her, where I say I've been doing
- 19 | things with her 11-year-old girl.
- 20 | Q. You had Liz's phone number, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. You did have Liz's user name that she used on KinkD, right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- Q. You had the chats with Liz on KinkD, right?
- 25 A. The minimal chats, yes.

- Q. You had Liz's 132 pages of chats with you on WhatsApp, right?
- 3 A. Yes. Which, as I just said, I felt were actually quite
- 4 incriminating for me, not so much for her.
- Q. And you had on your phone the attachments to those chats,
- 6 correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Those attachments included a picture of Liz, right?
- 9 | A. Yes.

8

- 10 Q. They also included pictures of the purported children,
- 11 | Kayla and Braydon, right?
- 12 A. Yes. Clothed, nonpornographic, legal pictures, yes.
- 13 | Q. You had a set of three pictures of the purported children
- 14 | from May 19, 2019, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And you had another set of pictures of Kayla on May 20th,
- 17 | 2019, correct?
- 18 A. Yes. Again, clothed, nonpornographic, legal pictures.
- 19 Q. You knew you had all of that evidence on your phone before
- 20 you were arrested, right?
- 21 A. If you really want to call it evidence, yes. I mean, I
- 22 | felt it was not evidence of very much.
- 23 | Q. In the chats, you discuss with Liz the things that you
- 24 could do with her purported children, correct?
- 25 A. Prior to the phone call, yes.

- 1 | Q. And some of those things included sexual activity, right?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. They include penetrating the girl, Kayla, right?
- 4 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

- 5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Objection to the characterization.
 - THE COURT: The witness has answered it. The question was not objectionable.
 - THE WITNESS: At the time I didn't think it was a child, but, yes.
- 10 | BY MR. LI:
- 11 Q. Liz said that it was okay for you to do those things in the chats, correct?
- 13 A. Yes, but she was still using sort of euphemistic fantasy
- 14 | language, like lessons and teachings. It still didn't seem
- 15 particularly explicit to me.
- Q. You don't think it's explicit that she agreed for you to penetrate the girl?
- A. I mean, yes, but it was, again, within a fantasy scenario, so it had an unreal element to it.
- Q. So, you agree that, at least to some degree, these chats were incriminating for Liz, too, right?
- A. I've said already to some degree, but I felt myself to a greater degree.
- 24 | Q. Now, you knew you had those chats on your phone, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And you said on direct examination you knew you had it, but you didn't want to go to law enforcement because you didn't want to turn over your phone, correct?
 - A. Yes.

4

- 5 | Q. You didn't want them to look through your phone, correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. You didn't want them to make a forensic image of your
- 8 phone?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. Isn't it true that you could have printed the chat
- 11 messages?
- 12 A. I don't know. Are there apps that will do that?
- 13 | Q. Well, you're a technology editor for Ars Technica, correct?
- 14 A. There are literally millions of apps available for android,
- 15 | and as broad as my technological knowledge is, I do not know
- 16 the purpose and function of every single one of those apps.
- 17 | Q. Do you know how to take a screenshot?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. Do you know how to print a screenshot?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Do you know how to email a screenshot?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. You could have printed screenshots of your chats with Liz,
- 24 | correct?
- 25 A. That would have removed the metadata from those chats.

- Q. You could have printed them, and they would have shown the content, correct?
- 3 A. They would have shown the content, but nothing else.
 - Q. You could have printed the attachments of the chats,
- 5 correct?

4

- 6 A. Yes. Again, that would strip the metadata.
- 7 | Q. You could have emailed the chats, correct?
- 8 A. I don't know. I could have emailed pictures of the chats,
- 9 but, again, that would strip the metadata.
- 10 | Q. Okay. So you agree you could have emailed screenshots of
- 11 | the chats, correct?
- 12 A. Yes, I suppose.
- 13 Q. You could have emailed the attachments of the chats,
- 14 | correct?
- 15 | A. I could have done many things, I'm sure, yes.
- 16 | Q. You could have printed the pictures of Liz -- excuse me,
- 17 | the one picture of Liz that she sent you, correct?
- 18 A. Yes, I -- yes.
- 19 | Q. You could have printed the pictures of Kayla that she sent
- 20 you, correct?
- 21 A. You mean the nonpornographic, legal pictures? Yes, I could
- 22 | have printed them, I suppose.
- 23 | Q. And you could have also printed the accompanying chats,
- 24 | correct?

25

A. Again, but that would have stripped them of their metadata.

- 1 It would have made them inauthentic.
- 2 Q. Now, if you had printed or emailed the chats, you wouldn't
- 3 | have had to give up your phone, right?
- 4 A. No. I would have had to buy a whole ton of paper and
- 5 printing ink, and I would have had to give over something that
- 6 struck me as something that seems very low value, but, yeah, I
- 7 could have.
- 8 | Q. So --
- 9 | A. I mean --
- 10 | Q. Is it your testimony that the messages of the texts have
- 11 | low value?
- 12 A. It is my testimony that stripped of all their metadata,
- 13 stripped of any authenticity, stripped of any evidence that
- 14 | they actually came from a particular person, yes, they are of
- 15 | low value.
- 16 Q. So, you said one of your concerns is that it's unclear who
- 17 | the participants are. Did I get that right?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. You had Liz's phone number, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And on the top of the -- excuse me. As part of the
- 22 | WhatsApp chats, you can see her phone number, correct?
- 23 | A. Right. But if you print something out, you could print
- 24 anything out. I could change the phone number. I mean, it's
- 25 | not authentic anymore. That's why the FBI, indeed, takes

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

Bright - Cross

- forensic images of phones, to make sure that all of its
 metadata is preserved and to make sure that the data taken from
 the phone can be sort of linked back to the phone. Printing
 would destroy all of that.
 - Q. Would you agree that there is some evidentiary value to seeing the chats where Liz says, as you agreed, incriminating things?
 - A. I already acknowledged that there is, yes.
 - Q. Would you agree that there's evidentiary value in the pictures that she sent you?
 - A. I've already acknowledged that there is.
- Q. And you could have emailed those items that had evidentiary value, right?
- MS. GALLICCHIO: Objection; asked and answered.
- 15 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 16 BY MR. LI:
 - Q. If you had emailed them, it wouldn't have wasted paper or ink, right?
- 19 A. No. Just...
- Q. So, it's your testimony today that you knew you had all of this evidence on your phone, but you just weren't comfortable giving up your phone, right?
- A. In part, that was my testimony, yes. I also say I think
 the evidence was, in and of itself, quite low value. I saw
 that the pictures were not, in and of themselves, evidence of

- anything illegal whatsoever. And I have said that, you know,
 an authentic chat log is one thing, but a screenshot of a chat
 log is quite another.
 - Q. But you agree that you knew you had the evidence on your phone, right?
 - A. Of very low value, yes.
- Q. And, in fact, you thought about it because you've been thinking -- you were thinking about the metadata problems,
- 9 || right?

4

5

6

- 10 A. Yeah. I mean, I used to work at a library, so, yeah,
 11 metadata is pretty important.
- Q. So you gave these issues of the evidence some serious thought, right?
- A. A little. It wasn't my overriding concern. My overriding
 concern was that they would incriminate me and that the rest of
 my phone would incriminate other people.
- 17 | Q. Now, the testimony you're giving here today is true, right?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. You swore an oath to tell the truth?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And you swore that oath yesterday, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. But you understand you're still under oath today, correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, please play Government Exhibit 9,

K3DKBRI3 Bright - Cross

1 | clip 13.

2 (Video playback)

- 3 BY MR. LI:
- 4 Q. When speaking with the FBI, you did not tell them you were
- 5 uncomfortable giving up your phone, right?
- 6 A. I couldn't. I had to protect my friends.
 - Q. Now, the FBI did ask you why you didn't turn over the
- 8 chats, right?
- 9 A. He did it as a kind of combined question. He asked about
- 11 Q. The topic came up, right?

the chats and the phone together.

12 | A. Yes.

7

10

- 13 Q. And you explained why you didn't give up the chats, right?
- 14 A. I think I said to him I didn't even think of that, didn't
- 15 | I? Or is there something else?
- 16 Q. So you agree you said, honestly, I didn't even think of
- 17 | that?
- 18 A. I agree that I lied to Special Agent Spivack, yes.
- 19 | Q. And you said that to the FBI after you were arrested?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. You knew it was for a serious crime?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And the FBI agents had asked you to be honest, right?
- 24 A. Yes. But I also felt that the consequences of them finding
- 25 | this information could be even more serious.

- Q. You told the FBI agents that you were going to be honest, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. But as you just said, you were not honest with them when
- 5 you said, "I honestly didn't even think of that"?
- 6 A. On this one occasion, yes.
- Q. So, on that occasion, when you said, "Honestly, I didn't
- 8 even think of that," you lied to the FBI?
- 9 A. Yes. I've already acknowledged that.
- 10 | Q. And I think you just said earlier one of the reasons you
- 11 | lied was because you didn't want to show them the incriminating
- 12 | evidence on your phone; is that right?
- 13 A. One of several reasons, yes.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, we can pull that down.
- 15 | Q. When you were arrested last year, you were 38 years old,
- 16 || right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you say you were not sexually attracted to children,
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, please pull up Government
- 22 Exhibit 40.
- 23 | Q. We're looking at a chat conversation between you and
- 24 someone whose first name is Anthony, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- MR. LI: Let's turn to the second page, please. Blow up the highlighted text.
- 3 BY MR. LI:
- 4 | Q. So back in 2012, someone you didn't know posted a picture
- 5 of his daughter on Facebook, right?
- 6 A. Yes.

7

- Q. You thought she might be 13, right?
- 8 A. Or something, yes.
- 9 Q. Around 13, right?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And you took a link to that photograph, correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And you sent the link to that photograph to Anthony?
- 14 A. Yes, when joking around with him.
- 15 | Q. You also wrote, "It's all I can do to not post 'I hit it,'"
- 16 || right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. When you say "hit it," you mean have sex with, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You also wrote to the Anthony person, "She looks ripe
- 21 | enough," correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And you wrote, "I'm not even saying it'd be legal," right?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 Q. And then you go on to say --

Bright - Cross

```
1
               THE COURT: Whoa, whoa. I think the question
 2
      was -- restate your question for the witness, if you will. And
 3
      then you wrote.
 4
     BY MR. LI:
 5
      Q. And then you wrote, "I mean, I'm not saying it'd be legal,"
      correct?
6
 7
     A. Yes.
               You didn't say that the first time.
8
9
               THE COURT: No, no.
10
               THE WITNESS: Sorry. He looked confused.
11
               THE COURT: Your answer to the last question is?
12
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you.
14
               All right.
15
     BY MR. LI:
16
     Q. And then you wrote, "Except in the Vatican (age of consent:
17
      12), " correct?
18
     A. Yes.
19
      Q. And then you wrote, "But like" -- and then the next
20
      sentence is, "I'd better wear a condom." The next sentence is:
21
      "We don't need more teenage mothers." You wrote all of those?
22
     A. Yes, alluding to an earlier conversation about Roman
23
     Catholicism and contraception, yes.
24
     Q. When you said, "I'd better wear a condom," you were
```

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

referring here to the girl whom you thought looked like she was

- 1 | 13 years old or so, correct?
- 2 A. In a -- I mean, not in a serious way, but, yes.
- 3 Q. And you say you were joking when you wrote this, right?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Is sending a picture of someone's 13-year-old daughter a
- 6 | joking matter to you?
- 7 A. It's context for the joke, yes.
- 8 MR. LI: Let's pull up Government Exhibit 42.
- 9 Q. This is a message exchange from your Google, correct?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 MR. LI: If we could blow up the highlighted portion.
- 12 | Q. You wrote in this chat, "There is no such thing as too
- 13 | young," correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. You also wrote in this chat, "I would bone a 15-year-old
- 16 girl in an instant," correct?
- 17 A. Yes. And then I followed it with a tongue-sticking-out
- 18 | smiley.
- 19 Q. So you agree you wrote those words, right?
- 20 A. Yes. But the tongue makes it clear that I'm not being
- 21 serious.
- 22 | Q. Okay. So you were joking when you wrote this, too?
- 23 A. Very clearly, yes.
- MR. LI: Let's pull up Government Exhibit 47.
- 25 | Q. These are your tweets, correct?

- 1 A. Some of them, yes.
- 2 | Q. You posted these tweets publicly, right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Now, you wrote, on the very bottom tweet here, "There is an
- 5 astonishing amount of jailbait on this flight. Looks like some
- 6 | school orchestra or something." You write that, right?
- 7 A. Yes. It's a descriptive tweet of what's happening in my
- 8 | life. That's what people use Twitter for.
- 9 Q. One of the descriptive words you used was jailbait, right?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And jailbait means a young girl, right?
- 12 A. It means teenage girls, I think.
- 13 | Q. The reason it's called jailbait is because it's someone who
- 14 | is typically below the age of consent, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And then you go on to write --
- MR. LI: Let's see the next message, please,
- 18 Ms. Fetman.
- 19 | Q. Then you go on to say, "Oh, Jesus Christ, they're talking
- 20 | about fucking Twilight, "right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 MR. LI: Let's go on to the next one, please.
- 23 | Q. Then you say, replying to @darthbender, you write,
- 24 | "Fortunately, they seem to be seated at the back of the plane."
- 25 | You wrote that, too, right?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. When you wrote that, you were still talking about the girls
- 3 you referred to as jailbait, right?
- 4 A. I think so.
- 5 Q. And this next message, you wrote, "Jailbait everywhere,
- 6 and, yet, my" -- excuse me. Let me restate that.
- And now you wrote, "Jailbait everywhere, and, yet, my
- 8 | row is old women. There's no justice, "correct?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 | Q. And when you say "jailbait" here, again, you're referring
- 11 | to young girls, right?
- 12 | A. Teenage girls, yes.
- 13 | Q. And you say you were joking when you wrote these, too,
- 14 || right?
- 15 | A. Yeah. I mean, it's irreverent social poetry. Nobody likes
- 16 | to have old people on their row in the plane because they get
- 17 up to use the bathroom a lot.
- 18 MR. LI: Let's blow up Government Exhibit 48, please.
- 19 | Q. You wrote this tweet, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. You posted it publicly, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And what you wrote was, "Admiring the jailbait on the
- 24 | train. Rowr." You wrote that, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Jailbait, in this context, again, means young girls, correct?
- 3 A. It means teenagers, yes.
- Q. It means teenage girls typically below the age of consent, correct?
- 6 A. Yes, maybe.

11

- 7 | Q. You were joking when you wrote that, too, right?
- A. I mean, I'm not joking that there were teenage girls on the train, but it's -- again, it's a lighthearted commentary on the daily happenings of my life. That's what my Twitter is a great
- Q. But when you refer to them as jailbait, that's what you
- were joking about, right?

deal of the time.

- 14 A. Yeah. It's a -- it's very widely used, but, you know, I'm
 15 knowingly using it in bad taste.
- MR. LI: Ms. Fetman, let's go back to Government
 Exhibit 47, please.
- 18 Q. In this top post, you wrote, "There is no justice," right?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. When you wrote, "There is no justice," what you meant was you wanted to be seated nearer jailbait, right?
- A. I think, actually, I meant more that I didn't want to be seated near old women, but...
- Q. But the contrast you set up in this sentence is between the jailbait that's everywhere --

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- and the old women in your row, correct?
- 3 A. Yes. Jailbait would be preferable to old women, yes.
- 4 MR. LI: Let's pull up Government Exhibit 46, please.
- 5 | If we can blow up the fourth post, please.
- 6 | Q. This is your tweet, right?
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. You posted it publicly?
- 9 | A. Yes.

8

- 10 | Q. And you wrote here to @realnudel, "I wouldn't disagree. I
- 11 | think age-based rape laws (rather than consent-based) are
- 12 | stupid, " correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 | Q. You say you posted this because you believe it's arbitrary
- 15 | to distinguish between someone who is 16 and someone who is,
- 16 | say, 15 years and 364 days old when it comes to the capacity to
- 17 | consent. Did I get that right?
- 18 A. Yes. But I just want to make clear that at the time I
- 19 | wrote this, I was in the U.K., where the age of consent is 16.
- 20 So that's the critical age, yes.
- 21 | Q. But the point is that there's an arbitrary distinction
- 22 | based on that biological one-day age difference?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. As it relates to the capacity to consent, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

8

9

10

- So in some cases, at least in the U.K., you believe that a 1 2 15-year-old could be capable of consent, correct?
- 3 I can imagine that someone a few minutes before they're
- 4 16th birthday could have the capacity to consent, I think, yes.
 - Could a 14-year-old be capable of consent?
- 6 I don't know. Maybe. I don't know. I have never -- I 7 haven't met every 14-year-old. I would be surprised.
 - Can you conceive of a possibility where a 14-year-old person was mature enough to have the capacity to consent?
 - I don't think there's any likely circumstance, no.
- 11 So, you believe that it is possible for a 15-year-old girl
- 12 to be capable of consent, but not a 14-year-old?
- 13 I don't know. Again, as I said, at the time, I'm not
- 14 proposing legislation here; I am trying to have a discussion
- 15 about some of the implications of the law. I think it's -- I
- don't think I've met every single 15-year-old in the world, so 16
- 17 I don't think I could say with any certainty one way or the
- 18 other.
- 19 So you think it is possible that in the U.K., that there is
- 20 a 15-year-old girl out there with the capacity to consent?
- 21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Yes. Sustained.
- 23 MR. LI: Just one moment?
- 24 (Pause)
- 25 No further questions. MR. LI:

K3DKBRI3

```
1
               THE COURT: All right.
               Redirect?
 2
 3
               MS. GALLICCHIO: I have no redirect, your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: All right.
 5
               Mr. Bright, you may step down.
 6
               I'm sorry?
 7
               MS. GALLICCHIO: Can we take a brief break?
               THE COURT: Yes.
 8
9
               But you may step down. Thank you.
10
               (Witness excused)
11
               THE COURT: Do you want to see me at sidebar?
12
               MS. GALLICCHIO: No, no, your Honor. I'm sorry.
13
               THE COURT: Okay.
14
               Do you want to call your next witness?
15
               MS. GALLICCHIO: Your Honor, at this time, the defense
16
      rests.
17
               THE COURT: All right.
18
               Is there any rebuttal case from the government?
19
               MR. LI: There is not, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: All right.
21
               Ladies and gentlemen, that completes the evidence in
22
      this case. It does not complete this case. The government has
23
      an opportunity to sum up, defense counsel may, if they choose,
24
      also sum up, but as I've told you, the defendant in a criminal
25
      trial has no burden, and that's their choice, whether they
```

K3DKBRI3

choose to do so. I've been told that they do.

And I believe the lunch has arrived. I'm going to have Flo check on that.

If the lunch has not arrived, then what we will do is the way the closing arguments work is that, because the government is the party with the burden of proof -- and there is no burden of proof on the defendant -- the government gets to deliver an opening closing statement, then the defendant may respond, and then the government may have a brief rebuttal. So that's the way the order of summations would go, and I'm advised that the government's initial closing would be approximately 30 minutes.

So what we'll do is we'll proceed now with that closing statement, then we'll break for lunch, and it's going to be a short lunch today -- we're not going to go a full hour, your lunch will be brought in -- and then we will hear from defense counsel, and the government's final rebuttal, and then I will deliver my instructions. And then, and only then, may you discuss the case amongst yourselves.

So, with that, are you ready, Mr. Li?

MR. LI: Your Honor, may we have a few minutes just to prepare the technology?

THE COURT: That's fine.

So why don't I do this, ladies and gentlemen, I'm just going to send you in the jury room for what I hope will be

```
under five minutes. So please do not discuss the case among
1
 2
      yourselves or with anyone.
 3
               (Jury not present)
 4
               THE COURT: Please be seated. We're in recess.
 5
               (Recess)
 6
               (Jury present)
 7
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
 8
               Mr. Li, whenever you're ready.
9
               MR. LI: Ladies and gentlemen, this is a case about a
10
              It is not about unconventional sex. It is about a
11
      simple rule: No sex with kids.
12
               We are not here because Peter Bright was interested in
13
      unconventional sex. We are here because Peter Bright was
14
      interested in having sex with children, with seven-year-old
15
      Kayla and nine-year-old Braydon, because he went to Duane Park,
16
      just a few blocks from here, so that he could arrange to have
17
      sex with Kayla and Braydon and entice them into engaging in
      sexual acts with him and with each other. That is against the
18
19
      rules. It's against the law.
20
               Ladies and gentlemen, this summation is the
21
      government's opportunity to walk you through the evidence and
22
      show you how it proves the defendant committed the crime of
23
      attempted child enticement. I'll do that in three parts:
24
               First, I'll cover the facts that are not in dispute or
25
      that can't be seriously disputed;
```

24

25

Second, I'll talk about the central question in this 1 2 case, which is whether the defendant really intended to have 3 sex with a seven-year-old girl and nine-year-old boy. I'll go through with you the overwhelming evidence that proves he did; 4 5 Third, I'll say just a few words about the law and how 6 you know that the defendant is quilty of the crime of attempted 7 child enticement beyond a reasonable doubt. So let's first talk about what's not in dispute or 8 9 that can't be seriously disputed. 10 First, there is no dispute that the person who chatted 11 with the mother on the internet, who spoke with the mother on 12 the phone, and who showed up to meet the mother, was the 13 defendant. You know this because he admitted it. 14 Second, there's no dispute the defendant used a phone. 15 I know it sounds trivial, but it's actually quite important for reasons I'll explain in a bit. Again, you know the defendant 16 17 used a phone because he admitted it. 18 Third, there is no dispute that, at some point, the defendant believed the children, Kayla and Braydon, were under 19 20 the age of 18. You saw the chats. The mother told the 21 defendant, right from the beginning, that her kids were seven 22 and nine.

Now, the defendant has said that he initially thought the kids were adults pretending to be children. That's not true. But it's also not important because even the defendant

admitted, because he had to admit, that by May 19th, 2019, when
he got the pictures of the children, he believed the children
were real and both under 18 years old. And, under the law, it
does not matter when he decided they were real children, just
that he believed they were real children by the time he showed
up for that May 22nd meeting.

Fourth, there is no dispute that the subject matter of the defendant's chats, calls, and meetings with the mother was sexual activity. The chats speak for themselves.

"It really depends on their experience, but I'm thinking maybe something involving foreskin is the way to start."

"How to hold my snake, showing her where the most sensitive parts of it are, the parts that feel best to lick or rub."

"How to take it in her hand and the kinds of motion that feel good."

It goes on, and on, and on.

When you go back to the jury room, take a look at all of those WhatsApp chats, all 132 pages of them, but take a look at the attachments, too. That's the STD tests that, yes, the defendant sent to the mother, that's the picture that the defendant sent of his penis after he admittedly realized the children were real, and there's the phone call where the defendant talked about his lesson plan to teach the kids about

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

his foreskin. There is no real dispute that all of these communications were about sexual activity. So that's what's not in dispute or can't be seriously disputed.

The defendant was the person communicating with the The defendant used a phone to do it. communications were about sexual activity, and at some point before meeting with the mother, the defendant believed the children were minors.

So what is in dispute? One fact, and one fact only: Did the defendant actually intend to have sex with the kids? Did the defendant mean the explicit words that he said and he wrote? Or did he think he was just role playing with adults pretending to be children up until May 19th, 2019, when he suddenly realized they were children and decided to catch the mother in the act? You already know the answer. You know the defendant meant every word he wrote and said. You know it because you had a chance to sit through this trial, and read the defendant's words, and hear about his actions. You know it for at least six reasons. Each of these reasons, standing alone, is enough to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to have sex with the children. Together, in combination, they are overwhelming.

First, the defendant continued to pursue Kayla and Braydon even after he admits he realized that they were real. Now, the defendant says he started to get suspicious when he

had the phone call with the mother on May 17th, 2019. He
agreed, at least in retrospect, it was a red flag. But what
did the defendant do after he got that red flag? Did he ask
the mother, hey, just to be clear, we're all adults here,
right?
Did he pump the brake on the sex talk while he figured
out what was going on? He didn't skip a beat.
Here's what he did: Right here, we see the defendant
acknowledging that red flag call he had just finished, "Great
chatting with you!"
"And you!"
The time was May 17, 4:13 p.m. No expression of
concern. None at all.
Now, at 5:23 p.m., about an hour later, he writes:
"Do you want the lessons to be heteronormative?" Then he
explains: "Does Kayla eat flowers and Braydon suck snakes?"
One hour and ten minutes after the call, when he

One hour and ten minutes after the call, when he supposedly started to get suspicious. These aren't the words of someone who has reservations or concerns, who's starting to get worried. These are the words of someone still discussing

his plan to have sex with the children.

An hour and change after that: "Some girls at a very early age discover that it feels good to rub certain bits, but, otherwise, help her discover that herself, touching or vibrating her clit, putting a finger inside, or maybe a very

1 | tiny toy."

And it goes on and on.

The simple truth is the defendant never saw any red flags. He wasn't looking for any red flags. He was only looking for a green flag, for go.

But here's the real kicker: The defendant said his aha moment, the time when everything clicked, was when he saw the pictures of the kids on May 19, 2019. But, again, what was his response? Did he take a pause to sort out the shock of his life? Did he ask the mother what was going on? Did he call 911? No. Here's what he did: 20 seconds after receiving a picture of the girl, 20 seconds, "She looks like a cutie."

27 seconds after he gets another picture, he replies, "Ooooh, play time sounds fabulous." Minutes later, "Kissing her flower, I'm sure it's beautiful."

"How big a boy is Braydon?"

What does he mean? Oh, his manhood.

And then a picture of his own penis. Let's pause for a moment here.

If the defendant really had this aha moment, if he had really developed this deep concern that children were involved, why would he send the mother a picture of his penis? Why would he expose this extremely personal photo to someone he believed was a child abuser? Someone who he supposedly was going to report to law enforcement?

K3DKBRI3

Summation - Mr. Li

The answer, ladies and gentlemen, is that the defendant sent a picture of his penis because he thought this was all real. He knew that children were involved, and he wanted to get involved himself. That is the only logical reason, the only reason that makes any sense why the defendant would send a picture of his penis. The defendant's conduct is not the behavior of some concerned citizen who suddenly realized that the person he was talking to was offering her children for sex. It's not someone who's suddenly scared and disgusted. It's the behavior of someone who thought he was going to have sex with kids, who knew that he was talking about kids, who was excited about it, and who was delighted to finally see pictures of them.

The second reason you know the defendant's intent is because he brought condoms to the meet. Now, why was he showing up with condoms? Well, he explained that during the chats, too. Here, we see the defendant's chats on May 19th, a few minutes after he sent a picture of his penis and less than an hour after he commented and saw the pictures of Kayla and Braydon. He explains he likes partners who are clean because condoms are much less fun.

The mother responds, she points out that he doesn't have to use condoms when he's teaching. She says: "Who wants to have to use condoms when teaching?"

He replies: "Well, yes, indeed. That way, condoms

Summation - Mr. Li

can be restricted to lessons about condoms." So the defendant is bringing condoms as part of his lessons about condoms, for his demonstrations.

The third reason we know the defendant's intent is the rape law tweet. You saw that in 2013, the defendant posted on Twitter: "I think age-based rape laws rather than consent based are stupid." Plain and simple. That's the defendant, in his own words, telling you that there should be no laws against children having sex with minors — excuse me, no laws against adults having sex with minors based on their age. He does not agree with statutory rape laws. But now the defendant wants you to think that he went to meet the mother with condoms in his pocket, STD tests, had them ready on his phone, to prevent adults from having sex with children. It is ridiculous.

Think about it for a second. There are folks out there who don't believe marijuana should be illegal. That's a legitimate debate. But do you think that folks who think marijuana should be illegal are out there trying to set up people who smoke marijuana for arrest? Of course not. Just like the defendant was not there to enforce the same age-based rape laws that he thought were stupid. He was there to have sex with the kids.

Fourth, the defendant admitted that he was also chatting online with a 14-year-old girl. Here's the defendant in his own words:

Summation - Mr. Li

(Video playback)

MR. LI: Ladies and gentlemen, you just heard the defendant say, in his own words, that he had flirty conversations with a 14-year-old girl, that he received pictures of her wearing panties and a T-shirt, and that he kept chatting with her because he found her attention flattering. This is not an example of Daddy Dom/Little Girl with a consenting adult partner. This is direct communication between the defendant and a 14-year-old girl. It shows you that the defendant's claim that he is not sexually attracted to children is false.

Fifth, the defendant has been talking about being sexually attracted to minors for a long time. You saw his Twitter posts about jailbait on a train, jailbait on a plane. You saw the defendant's personal Google chats where he talks freely about being attracted to young girls, a 15-year-old girl here, a 13-year-old girl there. I want to pause for a moment on one of these Google chats. This is Government Exhibit 40. This is a 2012 chat in which the defendant goes on the Facebook profile of a stranger, he grabs a picture of that stranger's daughter, he sends a picture of that girl to his friend, and then laughs about she looks like she's 13, but she's ripe enough for him to have sex with.

The defendant wants you to believe that he didn't intend to have sex with seven-year-old Kayla and nine-year-old

Summation - Mr. Li

Braydon, but what do the jailbait tweets, the Google chats, and the flirty conversations with the 14-year-old girl tell you about his intent in this case? That he did intend to have sex with the children on the day he was arrested.

The sixth reason you know the defendant's intent is because he made up this elaborate cover story, this get-out-of-jail-free card in case he got caught. The cover story was that he was this concerned journalist gathering evidence of child exploitation. He told that cover story to the FBI after he was arrested, and he told you that cover story again on the stand.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the defendant did not have to testify. He didn't have to take the stand. The burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt is, and always remains, on the government. We embrace that burden. But, in this case, the defendant did take the stand, and you have to evaluate his credibility just like any other witness. Ask yourself: What does the defendant have to gain by lying? And what does he stand to lose?

You saw his demeanor on direct examination, when he was trying to spin his story, and you saw him on cross-examination, when all the holes in his story came out. Ultimately, you have to ask yourself if his story makes any sense. The answer is no.

So how do you know the cover story is false? Let's

talk about all the holes in it.

The first, and most important, reason you know the defendant's cover story is false is because it changed. When he was arrested, he told the FBI that he was gathering evidence, and the only reason he didn't turn over the 132 pages of chat messages was because he hadn't thought of it. But now, on the stand, he claims he knew he had that evidence all along, but he didn't want to turn it over because he was afraid the chats were "quite incriminating for me, not so much for her," and because he didn't want the FBI to see what was on his phone. And he didn't think of just printing the chats out, or the attachments, or emailing them to the FBI.

This makes no sense. The defendant wants you to believe that he was smart enough to make a secret audio recording on a second phone, smart enough to write about Microsoft technology for a living, smart enough to think through the metadata issues with the chats, but he was too stupid to realize he could have just printed or emailed 132 pages of chats where the mother is talking about offering her kids up for sex? It's preposterous.

You know what really happened. The defendant knew he had the chats all along, but he never planned to turn them over, because they showed that he wanted to have sex with seven-year-old Kayla and nine-year-old Braydon. When the defendant got caught, and the FBI asked why he didn't turn over

the chats, he panicked, he said he forgot. But by the time he
had testified in front of you, he realized what he told the FBI
also doesn't make any sense, because how could he possibly
forget that he had 132 pages of incriminating chats? How could
he possibly forget about all of his conversations with
Princessmom, the mother?

So he tried to cover it up again by telling you that he only pretended to forget. Lies, upon lies, upon lies.

The next set of reasons you know the cover story is false is common sense, and we've gone over these. Vigilantes don't need to bring condoms to meet with kids. Vigilantes don't need to send pictures of their penises. And they certainly don't need to be asked, after confirming that the kids are real, what the size of a boy's penis is. There's no evidence-gathering purpose to bringing condoms or to finding out the size of a nine-year-old boy's penis. What was he going to do with that? Tell the FBI how big the boy's penis is?

And the defendant's own statements on Twitter and in his personal Google chats tell you that he thinks the age of consent is a joke, it's stupid, and it's certainly not something that he needs to go around enforcing.

The sixth reason you know the cover story is false is that the defendant never reported all the evidence he had. He had the mother's phone number, he had the mother's picture, he had the exact date, and time, and location of a meeting with

Summation - Mr. Li

her, he had 132 pages of chats describing, in graphic detail, all the sexual activity that he was going to engage in with Kayla and Braydon. That is the exact same evidence that is at the core of this case. If the defendant was such a concerned citizen, why didn't he go to the police with the amount of evidence he already had? Did he really believe he had to be in a bedroom with two kids and four condoms before he had enough evidence to go to the police? Of course not.

He never gave any evidence to the police because he never planned to give any evidence to the police.

Seventh, he started creating his cover story only after he decided there was a chance that the mother was a cop. You know that when he decided -- excuse me. You know when he decided that there was a risk. He told her on May 20th, two days before the meet. So now he's got a conundrum. He still wants to have sex with Kayla and Braydon, he still wants to teach them, but what if it's a setup? He figures out a simple way to bridge the divide. He continues to talk with the mother, to arrange the meeting, and he shows up to have sex. But he also creates an elaborate cover story about wanting to go to the police. Of course, he doesn't actually go to the police, that would ruin everything if it turns out that all his hopes had come true, that he could have sex with Kayla and Braydon, but -- but -- if there was a problem, he covered himself.

So what does he do all about contacting the police?

Takes two screenshots, and he makes a secret audio recording of the meet. Why? Because he thought there was a chance it might be a sting and he needed a cover story in case he got caught.

And the evidence is crystal clear that the fear of a sting was on the defendant's mind. He said so himself. May 20th, 2019,

"So my concern is, am I being set up here? I was struck by the fear yesterday that I'd be met by a cop or something."

Now, you heard the defendant's explanation on the stand. He was double-faking the mother. He said he brought up the police to convince her that he was not the police. That is absurd. It's absurd.

The defendant meant exactly what he said in these messages. He was afraid the mother was a cop. That's when he decided to set up his cover story in case he got caught.

Eighth, and finally, the defendant never told anybody he was going to meet the mother. If he was planning to catch a predator, why didn't he call the police? It would have avoided any risk that he was walking into a sting, and it would have given the police a chance to use all the information he gathered. Why wouldn't he talk to his deputy editor, someone who literally wrote a book on catching child predators? Why didn't he tell anybody at all? He didn't tell anybody because he wanted to keep the meeting a secret, and he wanted to keep it a secret because he was there to have sex with the kids.

Summation - Mr. Li

Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant's cover story about gathering evidence for law enforcement is ridiculous. It defies all common sense. It is a stunt to try to trick law enforcement, and now you, into giving him a get-out-of-jail-free card. And the fact that the defendant came up with such an elaborate cover story is powerful proof of what he really intended to do all along - to have sex with seven-year-old Kayla and nine-year-old Braydon.

Now, let me speak very briefly about age play -THE COURT: You have five minutes left.

MR. LI: Yes, your Honor.

Let me speak very briefly about age play, which the defense has spent a lot of time on in this case. Put simply, the defendant has told you that when he first spoke with the mother on KinkD, he thought the children were age playing as adults. The defense puts a lot of stock in the language used in the chats, words like mommy, which has simple everyday meanings. But you know what language does not appear in any of the 132 pages of chats between the defendant and the mother?

DDLG, DDLB, fantasy. That's the kind of explicit consent-based language that the defendant said he used with Stevie and Denesy, where the defendant said he had age-play relationships with. That is not the language in this case.

But you don't need to spend a lot of time analyzing the chats because the age-play issue is a distraction, it's a

Summation - Mr. Li

mirage. Even if the defendant mistakenly believed he was engaging in age play when he first started talking with the mother, he admits that by the time he got the pictures of Kayla and Braydon on May 19, 2019, he realized they were real.

So, after he got those pictures, he can't use age play to explain away his actions anymore. No matter what the defendant supposedly thought at the beginning, he certainly believed the children were real at the end.

I now want to go quickly through the elements of the crime of attempted child enticement. The government must prove each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt. I expect Judge Castel will tell you that the first element is that the defendant used a facility of interstate commerce, which can include a telephone. This element is not in dispute.

The second element of the crime of attempted child enticement is that the defendant knowingly attempted to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce someone to engage in sexual activity. Now, I've spoken to you at length about how you know the defendant intended to engage in sexual activity with the children, but I haven't said much about how he intended to do it.

Now, I mention this because the second element does require that the defendant persuade, induce, entice, or coerce the minors to engage in that sexual activity, but can do the persuading either directly or through a third party, like the

mother. In this case, the defendant intended to persuade Kayla and Braydon by giving them lessons, by offering to help them develop sexually. He also intended to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce them through the mother, who obviously could just tell her seven-year-old daughter and nine-year-old son what to do.

The second element of the crime of attempted child enticement also requires that the defendant take a substantial step towards committing the offense. I expect Judge Castel will tell you that a substantial step is something more than mere preparation, but it can be less than the last step necessary before actually committing the crime. That's why it's attempted child enticement.

Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant did not just talk about having sex with the children; he sent a picture of his penis and a copy of his STD test to assuage the mother he would be an acceptable teacher. He showed up to meet Kayla and Braydon with condoms in his pocket. Showing up is much more than mere preparation. It is a substantial step.

The third element of the crime of attempted child enticement is that the sexual activity violates New York law. I expect Judge Castel will explain to you that a variety of sexual contacts with someone under the age of 17 is illegal under New York law. The evidence plainly shows the defendant, a 38-year-old man, made lesson plans to teach a seven-year-old

girl and a nine-year-old boy about the foreskin of his penis, and he planned to penetrate the seven-year-old girl with his finger, a toy, or the tip of his penis. That violates New York law.

The fourth, and final, element of the crime of attempted child enticement is that the defendant believed the person he was enticing was under the age of 18. And that, we've already discussed.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of the day, one of two things is true: Either the defendant went to a meeting in Duane Park to gather evidence for law enforcement or he went to have sex with kids. All the evidence you have seen or heard points to one conclusion — the defendant is not an age player turned vigilante. He did not try to arrange a threesome of two adults pretending to be children only to learn they were children, only to then try to set up the mother for law enforcement, only to then accidentally bring condoms to the scene. He is a grown man who tried to have sex with a seven-year-old girl and a nine-year-old boy, and he —

THE COURT: All right, bring it to an end.

MR. LI: Very soon, this case will be yours. You will have heard the arguments, but when you go to the jury room to deliberate, it's the evidence that matters the most.

So take a close look at the evidence. When you do that, and when you apply your common sense, you will reach the

Summation - Mr. Li

only verdict consistent with the facts and the law - that the 1 2 defendant, Peter Bright, is guilty as charged. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Li. 4 All right. Ladies and gentlemen, this is what we're 5 going to do: We're going to break for lunch, your lunch is in 6 the jury room, and we'll take 30 minutes for lunch. Does that 7 sound reasonable? I don't want anybody to get indigestion, so if you 8 9 need more time, I can give you more time, and then we'll come 10 back, and we'll hear from defense counsel. 11 So, please do not discuss the case among yourselves. 12 Enjoy lunch. See you in a half an hour. 13 (Jury not present) 14 THE COURT: All right. Enjoy lunch. 15 MR. MAIMIN: Thank you. 16 MR. LI: Thank you. 17 (Luncheon recess) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

K3DLBRI4 Summations

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

1:38 p.m.

THE COURT: All right. Please stand for the jury.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

How is everyone doing? Good.

Ms. Gallicchio, you may begin, whenever you're ready.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you, your Honor.

The FBI went on a fishing expedition. They went fishing for a child molester. They threw out a net to catch a predator, but not in a pond where child molesters lurk. They targeted kinky people in a kinky dating site, and they went in blindly. Agent Jensen had little understanding of, and little regard for, the kinky community. She did no research or investigation other than reading the blurb on the KinkD dating app. She consulted no experts to understand who her target audience was. No psychologists, no sex researchers — like Dr. Cantor, for example — to better understand the kink community, the kink norms, and the kink language, or to help her understand who would be receiving the messages she was intending to convey.

Shockingly, she only had two weeks of training on how to be an online undercover. But she had no training on kink, other than conversations she had with other agents who sat next to her in the squad room. And they didn't have any training

K3DLBRI4 Summations

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

She did no research on the term "age-play." And, in either. fact, you heard her understanding of that term was off. She admitted that she had very little exposure to the kink of age-play before she encountered Peter Bright. She's a trained law enforcement professional searching out child molesters. incredibly worthy cause. But she entered a world she knew little about. That's reckless and dangerous. And even Agent Spivack, a trainer with the FBI, as you heard in the two interview clips that I played with Mr. Bright, had limited, if any, understanding of the kinky community, despite his claims to the contrary. And more importantly, he had absolutely no knowledge of Mr. Bright's kink of DDLG. Despite the lack of training and information, Agent Jensen created a profile on a kinky dating site, calling herself "Princessmom" and identifying her role as "mommy."

Now, Agent Jensen and Agent Spivack are the two witnesses, the most important witnesses, upon whose testimony the government is asking you to rely. And need you to rely to convict Mr. Bright of this very serious and horrendous crime. Agent Jensen is their star witness. But when she testified, she actually had the audacity under oath to tell you with a straight face that when she picked the role of mommy out of 29 kinky role options, that included "bold, pet, baby boy, baby girl" on a kinky dating site, that she intended to convey that she was an actual mother. Astonishing. And she had the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

further gall to tell you that she intended her self-summary to convey that she was looking for someone to molest her children, even though she admitted that she was intentionally ambiguous. She is either completely clueless or intentionally lying. Either option is disturbing.

If you think she is lying about that -- or quite honestly, even if you think she's just clueless about that world, it puts her entire testimony and the government's case into serious question. The only explanation for this lie is to attempt to cover up and fix a major problem in the government's case; that is, that no kinky person would ever have looked at Princessmom's profile and have seen an invitation to molest children. But that is, in fact, the government's theory. They have asked you to accept and believe beyond a reasonable doubt that from day one, Mr. Bright wanted to molest Princessmom's They're asking you to believe that he looked at her profile and recognized a fellow child molester, that he looked at her KinkD profile, and despite the fact that he's never molested children before and was into kinky sex with kinky adults, he saw the perfect opportunity to switch things up and now, at 38 years old, start molesting children. This is absurd. It insults your intelligence and common sense. Even if Agent Jensen really believed that the mommy option on a kinky dating site was meant to convey that she was a mother, her belief is irrelevant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

What is relevant is how it would be received and perceived by a practicing kinkster, or an age-player, on a kinky dating site. No age-player looking at her profile would think she was a mother looking for a child molester to have sex with her children. As Mr. Bright told you on the witness stand, her profile shouted age-play. It never ever has occurred to him of anything else. There is only one interpretation of her profile that makes sense, it's that Princessmom, with the role of "mommy," was a kinky person, a role-player, and an age-player. But in this fishing expedition of the FBI, not surprisingly, they caught the wrong fish. Unbeknownst to him, Mr. Bright got caught in this net. Not surprisingly, given where the net -- where they were fishing, they caught a real age-player and not a child molester. They reeled him in, talking at cross purposes, and they arrested an innocent man.

Can we put up the exhibit, please?

Remember these chats from Agent Jensen?

"Hmmm, may be looking for different things. It sounds like you are thinking about something different. Maybe I'm misunderstanding you, which is totally possible over text, lol."

Meaning is often misconstrued. These texts of Agent Jensen speak volumes. It's exactly what this case is about. This is exactly how mistakes are made and innocent people are

Summations

arrested. Meaning is often misconstrued. It is no surprise that a self-proclaimed age-player took the bait and got caught in the FBI's net. Mr. Bright messaged Princessmom because she was an attractive woman and he was interested in her, and asked her to elaborate on her admittedly ambiguous profile. And what does she say in response? "My princess is seven, and my prince charming is nine." She used the language that's used to age-players, whether she intended to or not.

And Mr. Bright responds in kind: "I'd love to hear more about the prince and prince charming, using the language he's used with handfuls of kinky people. And Agent Jensen doesn't say it's her real kids. She doesn't say her son or daughter or her children. In fact, in over 700 chats and a phone call, she never once utters the words "son," "daughter," or "children." She refers to them as her "kids" on the KinkD app, and then only again at the meeting at Duane Park. And by then, Mr. Bright was already caught in their net and was already well-aware.

Before I go on, I want to take a minute or two to talk about you and your task, the jury, in this case. It's a solemn duty to decide the guilt or innocence of a fellow citizen. You should treat this decision as one of the most important decisions you will ever make in your lives. It certainly is for Mr. Bright. Mr. Bright is protected by the presumption of innocence. In order to overcome that presumption, the

Summations

government must present evidence that leaves you so firmly convinced that Mr. Bright is guilty, that you have no reason to doubt the proof of each and every element of the crime charged.

Ask yourselves when analyzing this case. And after a careful analysis of the testimony, especially that of Agent Jensen, if you are persuaded by her story and have the confidence in her testimony that it overcomes the presumption of innocence, or does her testimony raise doubts, a careful analysis will reveal that her testimony is riddled with inconsistencies, it's confusing, at best, and implausible. We should expect more from law enforcement and the government when they arrest someone and bring charges. We should demand more. Your verdict can do that. We are confident that you will see that the government's evidence, their case against Mr. Bright, is full of holes and full of reasons to doubt.

And so now that you all have been educated on the subject of kink and age-play by Dr. Cantor, the director of Toronto's Sexuality Center; and by Mr. Bright, a practicing age-player, when you examine the chats -- and I ask that you do very carefully -- I ask that you look at them through the eyes of an age-player. And you will see that there are plenty of reasons to doubt. You know a lot more than you did when you first entered this courtroom about age-play, maybe even more than you wanted to know. And you know a lot more than Agent Jensen and Agent Spivack knew when they arrested Mr. Bright.

Summations

You know it's a fantasy, you know it's acting, and you know it's legal. If you do that, if you look at the chats through the eyes of an age-player, you will see that the conversations about teaching the prince and princess about their body parts is classic age-play. You will see that the discussions of kinks and limits is classic age-play and kink. You will see that the discussions about getting to know the princess and prince is classic age-play.

You have heard from Mr. Bright and from Agent Jensen that this is the very language he has used in many other age-play scenarios. Agent Jensen, specifically, recalled one, Stevie, where Mr. Bright texted the same interests, the same desires, the same fantasies, and used the same language that he was discussing with Liz. Mr. Bright told you of many, many more age-players that he's engaged with. He was a documented practicing age-player at the same time he was texting with Liz and long before. And by "document" I mean it's all over his phone, which is in the FBI's possession.

It doesn't matter, as the government suggests, that
Liz wasn't playing the role of a child, like Stevie did, or it
doesn't matter that the word "age-play" or "DDLG" doesn't
appear in the chats. In this particular scenario, under these
circumstances in a kinky dating site, it would have been
unnecessary. Where the roles are clearly selected and age-play
is assumed, there was no need to spell it out. There isn't a

Summations

rule book for age-players. It's the fantasy that matters. And if Mr. Bright found an opportunity to age-play with three adults, even better for him. All of it is an opportunity to explore the body of an adult man or a woman in a playful, legal way. Mr. Bright doesn't look for women or men who physically resemble children, just the opposite, as he told you. The age-play scenario is a means to an end: Sex with consenting adults. And Mr. Bright's age-play fantasy is exactly what Liz was offering.

Now, Mr. Bright's lifestyle may not be one that you understand or approve of. And some period of time sexual practices that you learned about during this trial may have shocked you a bit. And kink is certainly not everybody's cup of tea, but it is for a world of people. Mr. Bright's sexual practices are perfectly legal. Mr. Bright engages in kinky sex with consenting adults who are very open about their needs and their wants. He describes himself publicly on Twitter as "pan, poly, pervy." He enjoys kinky sex and he's openly kinky.

When you look at Mr. Bright's profile on KinkD, you will see that it's a far cry from a child molester. It reveals that he refers meaningful connections. Kink for him is about consent. It's about mutual satisfaction. It's about respect. It's about the appreciation of limits. You saw that he's passionate about these things. He's interested in long-term relationships with his kinky partners. He writes in his

K3DLBRI4 Summations

profile: "Mutual caring and understanding makes everything better." He communicates his desires to prospective partners and listens to their needs. He's comfortable, as you saw, talking about it. He's actively sexual. He has condoms ready. We will talk about that more in a bit. He's also principled about his sexual practices. What he isn't interested in is sexual contact with children. His interests couldn't be further from what I could only imagine are the interests of a child molester. There isn't a stitch of evidence that suggests otherwise.

In Mr. Bright's vast library of kinky chats and photos, there isn't one hint of a desire for actual children. There is no doubt that the vast resources of the FBI were employed to see if he was a child molester. They spent months examining his phone, his Google account, his search history, his Twitter account, looking for evidence that he was a child molester. They had FBI agents examining every photo, every chat, every email contact, every message contained on his phone and his Google account. They were looking for child pornography because Agent Jensen said it's an overt act. They found nothing. Not one photo, not one video of child pornography, nothing even close, because he didn't possess any, he didn't search for any, he didn't exchange any. There's another reason for that.

The government has asked questions about the fact that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

they haven't been able to get into one of his other phones or his desktop computer. But that's not what's important here, because what's important here is the fact that Mr. Bright gave the FBI full consent, free reign, to search all of his electronic devices. That's because he has nothing to hide and he did nothing wrong.

So what's next? Well, the FBI dug far and wide in search of examples in Mr. Bright's past that might suggest that in May of 2019, during his encounter with Liz, he intended to entice a seven and nine-year-old to engage in illegal sexual They had a technology expert, who you heard from, who searched 50,000 tweets. They searched his Google account. And what did they find? Tweets and chats containing off-color, crude, inappropriate and cheeky comments made eight, nine, ten, 11 years ago, some on public forums and some in private chats. And now they want to twist their meaning and argue that these comments somehow suggest that ten years later, Mr. Bright intended to entice a seven and nine-year-old to engage in sexual activity. When you look at this evidence, look at the comments and the context in which they were made, which is why you heard in the stipulation we asked the government to include the whole thing. Don't just look at the highlighted portion that the government wants you to look at.

Let's start with the *Twitter* exchange with Meowski Catovitch. That's when Mr. Bright -- seven years ago, Mr.

Summations

Bright makes the comment: "I think age-based rape laws rather than consent-based are stupid." It's a personal position on the arbitrariness of statutory rape, on the absurdity of the fact that the age of consent could differ from state to state and from day to day. Mr. Bright was engaged in a debate on what might be an unpopular position to take, just like his former boss, who you saw testify said he often did. He's provocative, especially online.

In Mr. Li's opening, and here in his summation, he said that Mr. Bright was declaring in this tweet that age-based rape laws, the same laws that the FBI was trying to enforce, are stupid. We're talking about apples and oranges. Mr. Bright is not stating that he doesn't believe in laws against having sex with children or advocating for legislation. Statutory rape laws are not the same as the laws prohibiting forcible rape of children. Mr. Bright's opinion expressed in this tweet has no bearing on his intention in this case. It's not an expression of a desire to have sex with children. As Agent Jensen said, meaning is often misconstrued.

And then we have the jailbait tweets made ten years ago when Mr. Bright was 28 years old. He's obviously joking. Perhaps crude and off-color, but a joke. It's a term we've all heard, I'm sure used jokingly and, of course, inappropriately. But it's absurd to think that the use of that term about teenagers suggests that, ten years later, Mr. Bright intended

Summations

to entice a seven and nine-year-old into illegal sexual activity. It's not an expression of a desire to have sex with children. Mr. Bright does not have any desire to have sex with children.

And then we have the Google chats, the chats amongst friends and someone who turned out to be Mr. Bright's wife.

Remember, Mr. Bright consented to the search of his account.

And please, again, read the whole portion, the whole context of those Google chats before you pass any judgment on them. Not just the highlighted portion the government wants you to focus on. And when you do, you will see the absurdity of the government's arguments regarding their relevance.

In particular, let's start with the one from Anthony M, where Mr. Bright said, "I hid it," a comment in reference to a profile photo of a man on Facebook, what looks to be his 13-year-old daughter. It's obviously a joke. It's a crude joke, no doubt, made in the context of other provocative, often offensive statements about the draft, about abortion, about the Catholic church and about the pope. Clearly Anthony M thought it was a joke by his responses. And you'll see that: "Hah hah hah, lol." And then we have the Google chat with his then-girlfriend-now wife. It's humorous banter between a boyfriend and a girlfriend about pop stars. Referring to a 13-year-old pop star, Rebecca Black, his girlfriend says: "You're not allowed to do her either." She's joking. And Mr.

Summations

Bright says, in all caps: "Too old? Lol." Is the government really, really arguing that Mr. Bright was serious when he said in all caps: "A 13-year-old is too old?" Are they really asking you to consider this comment relevant to his intention in this case? It seems that they are. Mr. Bright makes this comment to his adult girlfriend, who he later marries. It's not an expression of a desire to have sex with children. It's irrelevant to Mr. Bright's intentions. What it is, is the government grasping at straws.

And then finally there's this Google chat ten years ago. A woman is commenting about getting attention that's all too young. And jokingly, Mr. Bright says: "There's no such thing as too young. I'd bone a 15-year-old. In a minute," with a tongue-out emoji, which tells you the tone of this comment. It's crude, and it's vulgar, but it's a joke. Then they go on to banter about her being a cougar. Her response is clearly suggestive that it's a joke.

Remember, they searched 50,000 chats looking for evidence of child exploitation, and this is all that they found. There's only one thing that these three Google chats tell you: Mr. Bright can be raunchy, vulgar, crude, offensive, and, as his former boss said, provocative. Mr. Bright told you himself about his online persona and admitted that he's irreverent, contrary, purposefully annoying, and often inappropriate. It's really scary to think that comments made

Summations

K3DLBRI4

in jest with friends, girlfriends, or off-color jokes, or crude jokes made ten years ago, could actually be used against you in such an absurd way. It's astonishing that the government is actually asking you to infer from these off-color jokes and crude comments that Mr. Bright intended to molest a seven and nine-year-old. It's a distraction and nothing more.

7 ||

Lastly, the government offers Mr. Bright's own statements about his contact with a 17 and a 14-year-old on Google chats. Let's be perfectly clear. Mr. Bright never sought out the attention of a 14-year-old or a 17-year-old. He was not online looking for teenagers. He never asked for suggestive photos. In fact, he told her: Don't send photos. Don't. And he didn't download those photos. He cut her off. He never invited her to his house. He never spoke to her on the phone. He never met. He never sexted her. Mr. Bright thought she was a dumb teenager, as he told the police in his interview. Yes, it was stupid to engage with her. There can be no doubt about that. And people say dumb things online. But it's a giant leap to suggest that this one stupid act has anything to do with Mr. Bright's intent in this case. One has nothing to do with the other.

And the fact that he didn't call the police on this 14 and 17-year-old has no bearing on his intent in this case to notify the authorities if it turned out that Liz was an actual child molester. Mr. Bright explained the obvious difference.

to his intention in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you heard that over the last decade, Ars Technica, where Mr. Bright was working, they wrote extensively about legal repercussions of law enforcement in the lives of teenagers: Pot, sexting, sending nude selfies, and being prostitutes. Bright told Agent Spivack: "we've written stories about, for example, minors sexting each other. And it kind of ruins their lives when law enforcement gets involved." It's something he understands now. Mr. Bright's limited communication with this 14 and 17-year-old -- ill-advised, of course -- is irrelevant

Now, Ms. Baharanyi told you in her opening statement that Mr. Bright had nothing to hide. Not then, not now. took the witness stand and bared it all. You know more about him now than maybe you needed to know. And I'm sorry, Mr. Bright, but he does tend to ramble. But he is an open book, and he hid nothing. He told you that he had no clue that he saw Liz's profile as a mother looking for someone to molest or rape her kids. He had no clue she was a real mother. And why would he? The idea to him was preposterous. First of all, what are the chances that an actual mother who was looking for someone, a random stranger online to molest her actual children, even existed? As Mr. Bright said, it goes against everything the maternal spirit says it should. Why would anyone ever think that was real? Why would it ever cross your mind? And why would a mother do so brazenly advertise for the Summations

K3DLBRI4

world to see? Why would she advertise on a kinky dating site and not on the dark web, where molesters look? She wouldn't. And on the flip side, why would Agent Jensen think she reeled in a predator when she saw Mr. Bright's KinkD profile, other than the fact that she had little exposure to age-play and little understanding of the community she had inserted herself into? Why would a child molester look on a kinky dating site? Why would they reveal their real identity? Why would they reveal their personal information? Why would they send pictures of themself and their penis? Why would they send copies of their STD tests? A child molester wouldn't. Mr. Bright did.

Mr. Bright is indeed a tech savvy guy and a tech man. He of all people would know how to hide his identity if he was looking for a child to molest. If he created a published story, like the government said, it would have deleted his WhatsApp. Chat when it showed up. It wouldn't have such a public and open profile. When you look at these chats, I want to you look at them very carefully and think about maybe breaking them down into sections. And I would suggest looking at the chats before the phone call, pages one to 56; and then chats after the phone call, but before the photos of the children, pages 57 to 75; and then look at the chats after the photos of the children from page 75 on. You'll see that's clearly demarcated in the chats. You will see the progression

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

of Mr. Bright's realization that something sinister is going on.

There's nothing about the chats before the phone call that would create any doubt or concern that this wasn't just another kinky conversation. It was so clear that Mr. Bright was talking about sexual activities with consenting adults, not a single concern. Instead, these texts create a reasonable doubt when you look at them and put a big hole in the government's theory. He and Liz spoke in age-play terms using age-play language. In these chats, Mr. Bright and Liz discussed teaching scenarios with a princess and a prince charming. It's sexual, it's graphic. They discuss playtime, lessons, vibrators. He offers that he's uncircumcised. And the idea of a lesson involving his foreskin. He talks about his experience with other women, American women, in that regard. He talks about the eleven-year-old in the Bronx who's actually a 30-something woman named Alicia. He talks about teaching multiple orgasms. They talk about limits and kinks. They're talking about age-play. And these are obviously adult concerns. Let's be honest. If you are a child molester planning to teach a seven and nine-year-old about sex, would you be worried about their reaction to your uncircumcised penis? The same goes for multiple orgasms. How in the world is that relevant? It's not, because Mr. Bright is clearly talking about age-play with adults. Even in the face of this

Summations

absurdity, this disconnect, Agent Jensen never once sets the record straight. She never comes out of the "mommy" role-play character. She never stops using the classic age-play terms. She never said, by the way, these are my children, my actual kids, my son, my daughter. And even when there's no need for ambiguity, she never sets the record straight, despite numerous opportunities.

But Mr. Bright tells you that there was something off during this phone call. It was strange but not sinister. It was a red flag, but in retrospect. She mentioned taking the kids to park and Brayden to soccer. He didn't know what to make of it. He knew of age-players who lived a fantasy 24-7, but it wasn't that common and it wasn't really his thing. But it was her fantasy, and he was being invited in. He began to wonder though, could there be something else going on, something more sinister. But there really wasn't anything else to indicate that. The communication up to this point was classic age-play and fantasy and continued on the rest of that Friday night.

But in light of the peculiarity of this phone call and after the call, Mr. Bright begins picking up on a few more oddities in her language that caused some uneasiness. She asked if he had ever peed on a child, using the word, "child" when they were talking about his kink, instead of "little," or "little girl," or "little princess." She didn't understand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

what the term "heteronormative" meant, which was strange to him. And she revealed that she'd been molested as a child.

Over the next couple of days, that Friday night, all day Saturday, when he didn't have any communication with Liz, until he communicates with her again on Sunday when he receives the pictures, he's processing this disconnect. He's mulling the possibilities. He's looking back at the texts. And he's Is she a fantasist really committed to the fantasy? wondering: Is she a scammer, an online predator, or a real mother looking for someone to molest her kids? If she's a fantasist committed to the fantasy, he's still game. But if she's a child molester, he came up with a plan: He'd play along, he'd play this out, and he'd gather information and turn her over to the police. And then it's confirmed. Two days later she sends photos of her children. Four days and hundreds of messages after Mr. Bright first asked for them. One month after the first communication on KinkD.

And he didn't ask for photos, like Mr. Li wants you to believe. He didn't say: Send me pictures of your children or kids. He asks as an age-player. Got any family photos? I'd love to see my students. Why doesn't Agent Jensen — it would have been the perfect way to set the record straight from the beginning, to clear up any ambiguity. Send the pictures of the kids and let's either cut this off or move forward. What was her reason? She didn't have the approval of the supervisor

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

yet; and, in fact, she didn't ask for it. If she really believed he was a child molester and they were on the same page, why wait four days? Why wait a month from when he first reached out to her on April 18th? It seemed she knew they were talking at cross purposes. Meaning is often misconstrued.

You heard Mr. Bright's reaction to the photos. He was disgusted and horrified, but he was ready. It wasn't an "ah hah" moment, as Mr. Li describes it. He had already considered the possibility that she was a child molester and decided if was true, he had to do something to stop her. So he plays along, switching mode but not vetting mode. He comments about the pictures like she would expect he would, without delay. He stays in role, a new role. She asks him to send a picture of his penis, and he does. It was his way of staying in role and playing along so she doesn't go silent. I admit, it's an odd thing to do under the circumstances, but we know it's not that odd for Mr. Bright.

It's not an extremely personal photo, as Mr. Li said, for Mr. Bright. His phone is full of pictures and videos of his penis, and he admittedly shares them freely. And he sent it to Liz. And you will see in the text that they then -- the two of them -- engage in banter about it. He doesn't tell her to show it to the kids. And then he starts digging and continues to formulate his plan.

The content, you will see changes. Despite what

Summations

K3DLBRI4

Mr. Li said, the content changed dramatically after the photos are sent. Remember when I'd asked Agent Jensen about this, and she was leafing through the chats, pages and pages, looking for sexual conversation involving the children after the photo was sent, and she didn't find any? The discussion of sexual reference stopped. Mr. Bright was playing along, but he

7 | couldn't go that far.

He starts to ask questions. He asks if he's being set up to throw her off. He asked personal questions about her sexual history. He asked if she's communicating with anyone else on KinkD. And when she says no, that's when it really seals the deal that he has to do something. He asks for her address. He asks for more pictures. He takes screenshots of her KinkD profile. And then he decides to get her on tape, telling her he'd like to talk with her first without the children, so he could try to get her to say something incriminating. And he shows up an hour before the time he believed the children would be arriving. And he waits and he waits because the FBI delayed the meeting. The FBI pushed the meeting closer and closer to the time when the kids would be coming home, not Mr. Bright.

And why didn't he go to police? Well, the proof is in the pudding. We're here. You saw the behavior of the agents who questioned Mr. Bright. Agents Spivack and Adamczyk, who questioned him with no real understanding of kink, age-play,

Summations

DDLG. They were closed-minded and unwilling to hear what Mr. Bright had to say. They were aggressive at times. They cut him off when he tried to answer the questions. Being in a kink community, Mr. bright knew the stigma. He knew the misconceptions. He didn't want to expose himself and his sexual practices to police scrutiny. He didn't want to turn over his phone if he didn't have to. He didn't want to violate the privacy of the people who trusted him with personal information and sexually explicit photos.

Yes, Mr. Bright told one lie to Agent Spivack about not having considered the option of going to the police or the FBI and saying, Here's my chats, here's my phone. He lied because he didn't want to have to give Agent Spivack the real reason why he did it, and draw attention to the very thing on his phone he was hoping the FBI wouldn't see. And what if he goes to the police at that moment without getting more information and is wrong about Princessmom? So he decides to make a recording. That's the best evidence, isn't it? It's exactly what the FBI tried and failed to do. The recording speaks volumes about his intentions and creates a reasonable doubt.

The government argues that this recording is just a coverup in case he gets caught. This idea of a coverup is the only thing the government can say about it and they have to say about it. Otherwise, the recording is proof that Mr. Bright is

Summations

K3DLBRI4

innocent. And why is he creating a coverup? Would he record himself committing a crime? Why wouldn't he delete the chats on his phone before he shows up, and all the other sexually explicit things that he didn't want the FBI to see? He wasn't, as Mr. Li seems to suggest over and over again, just a concerned journalist gathering evidence. His job as a journalist has nothing to do with this case. Mr. Bright never told anyone he's an investigative journalist working on a story.

You've heard the recording Mr. Bright made as he waited for Liz. He expressed amazement that a woman would really be offering her kids for sex, how it has to go against everything the maternal spirit says it should. He muses about how funny it would be if she was trying to set up a sting, sting the counter-sting. And he asked: What do you have to say for yourself, Peter Bright? He wasn't reading from a script. This is spontaneous and expressed genuine disbelief. He's not creating a cover story. What he doesn't do, most importantly, is an overt act.

Remember that term that Agent Jensen used. He doesn't show up with STD tests that the government wants you to believe. You heard about the importance of this overt act.

It's a common FBI technique to ask the suspect to bring a piece of physical evidence to the meeting, which would be strong evidence of intent and, therefore, guilt. Agent Jensen asked

K3DLBRI4 Summations

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for a printout of STD tests as a requirement to engage in sexual activity with her kids. Remember, the screenshots of the STD tests were sent long earlier during the first chats before the phone call. And Mr. Bright told you about how it's common in the KinkD community, more so than the vanilla community, to share STD tests. Agent Jensen, though, asked for a printout because she wanted more of the STD tests as requirement. If that was Mr. Bright's intention, to engage in sexual contact with kids, Mr. Bright would have printed those STD tests out, had them in his pocket with the rest of his pocket litter. He didn't even have a screenshot at all on his Instead, he had to pull up the website of the testing facility and access his account toll find the results. You will have an opportunity to listen to that recording again. You will see how long it took. And you will hear how Agent Jensen had to prompt him with the date of the results to help him find it. The fact that he doesn't have them at the ready speaks volumes. It's reason to doubt the government's case and it tells you Mr. Bright is innocent.

So let's talk about the condoms for a minute, because Mr. Li gives them a lot more importance than he should. The fact that Mr. Bright carries condoms is proof of nothing, more than the fact that he's sexually active and responsible. He didn't bring them to the meeting, he had them in his pockets. He told you, and he told Liz and Agent Spivack, about his date

Summations

K3DLBRI4

on Friday night before the meeting. He told you and Liz that he had a date planned on the night before the actual meeting that didn't materialize. He told you that he uses condoms even with his wife. He told you that he's — to use his words — promiscuous and spontaneous sexually; that if his Scruff, Tinder, KinkD, etc., dating apps alert him to a hookup

opportunity, he might just take it, and he needs to be ready.

He told you about his dressing habits and his pocket habits, how he fills his pockets with what the FBI describes as pocket litter, and he leaves it there until the next time he puts on the same pants. He has a boarding pass in his pocket from May the 9th, a movie theater receipt from May 19th, an empty Viagra pocket from Friday night. His pockets are his purse. If I emptied my purse right now, it would reveal lots of things that I don't need or use, that I put in there days, weeks, probably even months earlier. And when I change purses,

In Mr. Li's opening he told you — and I quote — "In April 19th, defendant reached out online to a person he believed to be the mother of two children." That's evidence that you didn't see in this case. It's not true, and it was misleading. Mr. Li told that you Mr. Bright told the mother he wanted to teach her kids about sex. That's not evidence in this case. It's not true and it's misleading. Mr. Li told you in his opening statement that in the chats, Mr. Bright

it all gets transferred. It's as simple as that.

described in detail exactly what he meant, that he would insert a finger and a small toy into the girl and have the children play with his penis. You didn't hear evidence of that in this case. It's misleading and not true.

THE COURT: You have five minutes left.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you.

And Mr. Li told you that Mr. Bright asked for pictures of the kids. Misleading and not true. And Mr. Li, finally repeated over and over, and even today, something that Agent Jensen never called herself, "mother."

The government's theory is, from day one, Mr. Bright wanted to molest Princessmom's kids. If you don't buy that theory, then their case falls apart. Because if you believe that Mr. Bright reached out to Princessmom out of a genuine age-play interest, then the only way that you could find him guilty of this horrendous crime is by believing that somewhere along the line, maybe after receiving a couple photos of clothed children, Mr. Bright, all of a sudden, turned into a child molester. And that's just nonsense.

Mr. Bright is here at this table because of a careless and reckless fishing expedition of the FBI. Agent Jensen, with little guidance and little training, ventured into a community she knew little about and misunderstood and misconstrued.

Let's hope they learn something. It's too late for Mr. Bright. He got caught in the net not meant for him, an age-player

Summations

looking for a kinky threesome with consenting adults. When he discovered that this kinky encounter was not what he thought it would be, something sinister, he did what he thought was best, to catch her. Maybe his plan wasn't perfect. Maybe it wasn't the best plan. Maybe it's not the plan you'd come up with. But Mr. Bright never found himself in this situation before and he sorted it out the best way he could.

Mr. Bright never intended to engage a seven and nine-year-old in sexual activity. There is no evidence of enticement here at all. He had no idea that Kayla and Brayden were actual children when he engaged Liz in sexual conversation. When he did realize it, the lesson plans and sexual conversation related to who he then believed — now believed — were children stopped. When he showed up on May 22nd, his only intention was to get Liz on tape, get her address, and later report her to the police. He had no intention of even seeing her children.

Mr. Bright is innocent, and the government's case is riddled with reasonable doubt. You will find reasonable doubt in the KinkD communications and the WhatsApp chats themselves, viewed with the eyes of an age-player. You will find reasonable doubt in the documented evidence that Mr. Bright was a legitimate and practicing age-player before and during the communications with Liz. You will find reasonable doubt in Mr. Bright's behavior in recording the conversation. You will find

Summations

reasonable doubt in Mr. Bright's willingness to speak to the police and consent to search his electronics. You will find reasonable doubt in the absence of child pornography. You will find reasonable doubt in the lack of an overt act. And this is just a few examples.

We ask you to untangle this net that Mr. Bright has been caught in. And when you do we are confident that you will return the only verdict that serves justice and sets Mr. Bright free, and that is not guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Li, whenever you're ready.

MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor.

This case is not about the FBI. Defense counsel spoke for so long about Agent Jensen, not because she is a star witness but because she isn't. The star witness is Peter Bright. The evidence of guilt is in what the defendant said and in what he did. That's why the defense asked to look somewhere else.

Now, the defense theory appears to be that this is all just one big misunderstanding. Yes, the defendant exchanged hundreds of chat messages that appear to be about sex with children. Yes, he sent pictures of his STD tests and his penis. Yes, he showed up at a meeting with an undercover agent with condoms in his pocket. But no, he did not intend to have sex with children. He got tricked by an FBI agent who used

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summations

secret age-play code words, "mommy," "prince," "princess." He thought he was talking to an adult looking to offer two other adults pretending to be children up until the moment he got pictures of what appeared to be actual children. And then he became a vigilante working in secret to enforce the child exploitation laws.

Now, this theory has a very convenient feature for the defendant. He can do no wrong. No matter how sexually explicit the chats are, no matter how graphic the photos, no matter how far he goes to actually meet seven-year-old Kayla and nine-year-old Brayden, his answer is always the same: was just pretending. At first, the defendant says he was age-playing because the mother never told him explicitly that the words "my kids" meant "my real kids" and not my adult friend -- but when he received pictures of Kayla and Brayden, which was undeniable proof the children were real, well, he just seemingly shifted into vigilante mode. He kept doing the same things, talking about what he wanted to do with the kids, sending graphic pictures, trying to arrange a meeting. But now he had just had a different reason. The defendant is asking you to just close your eyes and believe that no matter what he said or what he did, he was always just pretending. Except, the overwhelming evidence proves he wasn't pretending.

I gave you the government's case. I won't go through it again. Instead, let's just discuss a few of the arguments

Summations

the defense has made. Let me start with age-play.

The defense has spent a lot of time talking to you about the defendant's fetishes. Now, let me be clear, the defendant's sex life is not on trial. There is nothing illegal about role-play or other kink activity with consenting adults. We're here today because, in May 2019, the defendant tried to have sex with what he believed to be actual children. Not adults acting out a mutual fantasy, but children. And trying to have sex with a child is a crime.

Now, the defense wants to make this trial into something it isn't about, to frame it as if, if he is into kink, then he can't intend to have sex with minors. But the fact is, someone can want to have sex with adults pretending to be children, and also want to have sex with children as well. The defendant can be an age-player on Monday and a child enticer on Wednesday. These things are not incompatible. The defendant's membership in what he calls "the kink community" is not a reason to find him guilty of anything, but it is also not a free pass when he does commit a crime. That's why we're here today.

Now, the defense has spent a lot of time arguing that the defendant thought the mother was an age-player because her KinkD profile said "mommy" and she didn't use explicit words like "mother" or "son" or "daughter" or "child." But isn't it convenient? Every word she does use -- "kids," "my kids,"

Summations

"Kayla," "Brayden," "seven years old," "nine-year-olds," the defendant says, well, that's age-play. Do you really believe that if she had said "child" instead of "kid," the defendant would admit today that he knew it was actual children?

And the defense already has it flipped. If the defendant really thought he was age-playing with the mother, he would have used the language of age-play. Dr. Cantor and the defendant both told you how important knowing consent is to age-play. Dr. Cantor told you that some age-players even sign written contracts to document their consent. So where is the explicit consent for age-play in this case? Nowhere. It doesn't exist. Not once does the defendant refer to "DDLG" or "DDLB" or "fantasy" in all of his communications with the mother. But you know where those explicit words of age-play do appear? In his chats with Stevie and Denesy. And most importantly, even the defendant admits that by time he showed up in the park, he believed the children were real. So what he initially thought really doesn't matter.

Now, the defense has put a lot of stock in the audio recording that the defendant made of the meeting with the mother. Now, I want to take a minute to really think about how this recording came about. Picture this. The defendant gets on the subway. It's an hour before the meeting. He knows it's one of two things: Either he's finally going to get to meet seven-year-old Kayla and nine-year-old Brayden, or it's a

Summations

I better record this. Maybe I better have something just in case. You know the old saying: Hope for the best, prepare for the worst. He's sitting on the train. He gets off, he starts walking to the park. Then he gets another idea: "Approaching the park where she said we'll meet. Now we'll find out if a woman really is offering her children for sex."

Ladies and gentlemen, nobody talks like that. This is not some narration of the defendant's innermost thoughts perfectly recorded on tape. This is none sense. This is a preplanned fabrication made by somebody who watches too much tv, who thought he could just record a voiceover, hit play for the FBI and walk away scot-free. These are self-serving statements made alone with no apparent purpose, except to play for the cops in case he was ever arrested.

Now, the condoms. The defendant has to explain away the condoms, because why would he bring them if not for Kayla and Brayden? So he comes up with this story about the condoms being left over from his Friday night date. But if you look at the details, his story falls apart.

Now, let's pause here for a second. Remember how Ms. Gallicchio said that the moment Liz sent the photos, the defendant stopped discussing lessons? I think that's probably a mistake. Right there, just an hour after he gets the pictures, he writes: "That way, condoms can be restricted to

Summations

lessons about condoms." He texts about it up until the moment 1 2 before the meet. 3 When you get back to the jury room, look at page 130 4 of the chat, and you'll see. 5 Now, as we discussed, he said in his chats that the 6 condoms were not for him to wear, they were for lessons for the 7 kids. And that is important. And that's where the details really matter. And I do apologize for some of this. 8 9 condoms he normally uses, they're normal condoms. You know 10 that because they're in his wallet. This is Government Exhibit 11 10. The regular blue Trojans are what he uses. That's what he 12 carries around in his wallet. After all, as he says in his 13 chats about his penis, "I think it's a reasonable size, though 14 far from huge." Look, there's nothing wrong with that, but it 15 means he's using normal condoms. But then he shows up with fresh Trojan magnums. Extra large condoms. Not condoms that 16 17 would fit him, but condoms that would be perfect for teaching 18 children to about how to use condoms, to show them how to put them on a vibrator or --19 20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Objection. 21 THE COURT: Basis? 22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Pure speculation. 23 THE COURT: Overruled. 24 MR. LI: -- to show them how to put those condoms on a 25 vibrator or banana or whatever else he wants to use.

Summations

know his story about the condoms being left over from his

Friday night date is a lie. Why? Because they would not fit

him. Not Friday night, not the date of his arrest, or any

other time. He was carrying extra large demonstration condoms

in order to, in his own words, "provide lessons about condoms."

At the end of the day, the defendant's story is absurd. It just makes no sense. To believe it, you have to believe the defendant is the unluckiest man in the world. He had the bad luck of misinterpreting the mother as being an age-player, even though the mother didn't select "age-player" as an option, deciding just this one time not to discuss age-play or DDLG explicitly. The mother — what appeared to be actual children.

THE COURT: Five minutes left.

MR. LI: Being so committed to protecting children that he responded to this new development in a way completely indistinguishable from his earlier conversations about sex, and then forgetting he had condoms on him when he went to meet the mother and Kayla and Brayden, and having written about how he thinks age-based rape laws are stupid, and having constantly joked about jailbait and how he would like to have sex with 13 and 15-year-old girls. And of course, he has the bad luck of a 14-year-old girl sending him suggestive pictures that he never asked for in his flirty conversations with her.

Ladies and gentlemen, come on. Nobody is that

K3DLBRI4 Summations

unlucky. The defendant meant what he said in his private chats about wanting to have sex with kids. He meant what he said on Twitter about age-based rape laws being stupid. He meant what he said in his chats with the mother about wanting to have sex with Kayla and Brayden. And he meant what his actions showed when he arrived at the meeting with condoms ready to go.

(Continued on next page)

MR. LI: (Continuing) What the defendant is really asking you to do is to not believe two things — his words and his actions. He wants you to disbelieve him when he speaks openly about wanting to have sex with kids and when he chats privately about actually doing it with seven—year—old Kyle and nine—year—old Braydon. He wants you to ignore the fact that he showed up to a meeting with the mother and started to walk to the apartment where the kids lived. Instead, he wants you to accept the self—serving lie that he made up on the day of the meeting, after he became afraid of a sting, and ignore everything he said and everything he did before, which amounts to simply this: That he intended to have sex with a seven—year—old girl and a nine—year—old boy.

Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant has left with a pile of lies, but you have everything you need to cut through it. You have the evidence, and you have your common sense. So when you go back to the jury room, look at the evidence in this case, read the chats, which the defendant wrote before he had a reason to lie. Look at the condoms, which speak louder than words. Remember the testimony of the witnesses. When you do, you will conclude that the defendant is not an age player turned vigilante; he is guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Li.

Members of the jury, you have now heard all the evidence in the case, as well as the final arguments of the

Charge

parties. We have reached the point where you are about to undertake your final function as jurors. You have paid careful attention to the evidence, and I am confident that you will act together with fairness and impartiality in reaching a just verdict in the case.

It has been my duty to preside over the trial and to decide what testimony and evidence was relevant under the law for you to consider. My duty, at this point, is to instruct you on the law, and it is your duty to accept these instructions of law and to apply them to the facts as you determine them.

If any attorney has stated a legal principle different from any that I state to you now in my instructions, it is my instructions that you must follow. You must not substitute your own ideas of what the law is or ought to be.

You are not to infer from any of my questions, or rulings, or anything else I've said or done during this trial that I have any view as to the credibility of the witnesses or how you should decide the case.

I will give you the typed text of these instructions for your use in the jury room. It is possible that there is a slight variation between the words I have spoken and the typed text that I will give you. The words I have spoken control over the typed text.

One second at sidebar, please.

	K3DKBRI5 Charge
1	(At the sidebar)
2	THE COURT: Do you have the verdict sheet and the
3	indictment?
4	MR. LI: We can print those quickly, your Honor. I
5	apologize, we did not bring them.
6	MR. MAIMIN: I'm happy to run downstairs and take care
7	of that right now.
8	THE COURT: Tend to that, please.
9	MR. MAIMIN: Absolutely.
10	THE COURT: So four copies of the indictment and
11	twelve copies of the verdict sheet.
12	MR. LI: Yes, your Honor.
13	MR. MAIMIN: Sure.
14	Did your Honor send us a verdict sheet?
15	MR. LI: No. We created one last night.
16	THE COURT: Thank you.
17	And you can work with my law clerk if you need help.
18	(Continued on next page)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	1

(In open court)

THE COURT: As members of the jury, you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts. You pass upon the evidence. You determine the credibility of the witnesses. You resolve such conflicts as there may be in the testimony. You draw whatever reasonable inferences you decide to draw from the facts as you have determined them. You determine the weight of the evidence. You have taken the oath as jurors, and it is your sworn duty to determine the facts and to follow the law as I give it to you.

It is the duty of attorneys to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence that the attorney believes is not properly admissible. Therefore, you should draw no inference from the fact that an attorney objected to any evidence. Nor should you draw any inference from the fact that I sustained or overruled an objection.

Your verdict must be based solely upon the evidence developed at trial or the lack of evidence. The parties in this case are entitled to a trial free from prejudice about a party's race, religion, national origin, sex, or age. Our judicial system cannot work unless you reach your verdict through a fair and impartial consideration of the evidence.

Similarly, under your oath as jurors, you are not to be swayed by sympathy. Once you let fear, prejudice, bias, feelings about the nature of the crime charged, or sympathy

Charge

interfere with your thinking, there is a risk that you will not arrive at a just and true verdict. Your verdict must be based exclusively upon the evidence or the lack of evidence in the case.

The fact that the prosecution is brought in the name of the United States of America entitles the government to no greater, and no lesser, consideration than accorded to any other party to a litigation. All parties, whether the government or an individual, stand as equals under the law.

The defendant in this case, Peter Bright, has entered a plea of not guilty to the indictment. The law presumes a defendant to be innocent of all the charges against him. The defendant is to be presumed by you to be innocent throughout your deliberations until such time, if ever, that you, as a jury, are satisfied that the government has proven the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to require an acquittal of a defendant unless and until, after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you, as jurors, are convinced unanimously of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The question that naturally comes up is: What is a reasonable doubt? The words almost define themselves. It is a doubt founded in reason and arising out of the evidence, or the lack of evidence. It is a doubt that a reasonable person has

possible doubt.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

after carefully weighing all the evidence. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, must be proof of such a convincing nature, that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it in the most important of his or her own affairs. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is not proof beyond all

Reasonable doubt is a doubt that appeals to your reason, your judgment, your experience, your common sense. is not caprice, whim, or speculation. It's not an excuse to avoid the performance of an unpleasant duty. It is not sympathy for the defendant.

The government must prove each and every element of the crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden never shifts to the defendant. The law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence. Even if Mr. Bright has presented evidence in his defense, it is not his burden to prove himself innocent. The fact that one party called more witnesses and introduced more evidence does not mean that you should find in favor of that party. It is the quality of the evidence that matters.

If, after a fair, and impartial, and careful consideration of all of the evidence, you cannot honestly say that you are not satisfied of the quilt of a defendant -- that is, if you have such a doubt as would cause you, as a prudent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

person, to hesitate before acting in matters of importance to yourself -- then you have a reasonable doubt. In that circumstance, it is your duty to return a not-quilty verdict for the defendant.

On the other hand, if after a fair, impartial, and careful consideration of all the evidence, you can honestly say that you are satisfied of the quilt of a defendant, and that you do not have a doubt that would prevent you from acting in important matters in the personal affairs of your own life, then you have no reasonable doubt. Under the circumstances, you should return a quilty verdict for the defendant.

The evidence in this case is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits received into evidence, and the stipulations made by the parties.

By contrast, the questions of a lawyer are not evidence. It is the witnesses' answers that are evidence, not the questions.

Testimony that has been stricken or excluded by me is not evidence and may not be considered by you in rendering your verdict. If I have instructed you that, as I have in this case, that evidence is received for only a limited purpose, then it may be considered only for that limited purpose.

Arguments by lawyers are not evidence because the lawyers are not witnesses. What the lawyers have said to you in their opening statements and in their summations are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

intended to help you understand the evidence. If, however, your recollection of the facts differs from the lawyers' statements, it's your recollection that controls.

To constitute evidence, exhibits must first be admitted or received in evidence. Exhibits marked for identification, but not admitted, are not evidence, nor are materials brought forth only to refresh a witness' recollection.

It is for you alone to decide the weight, if any, to be given to the testimony you have heard and the exhibits you have seen.

Generally, there are two types of evidence that you may consider in reaching your verdict. One type is direct evidence. That's when a witness testifies about something he or she knows by virtue of his or her own senses - something he or she has seen, felt, touched, or heard.

Circumstantial evidence is evidence from which you may infer the existence of certain facts. Let me give you an example to help you understand what is meant by circumstantial evidence.

Now, I want you to imagine the following circumstance: Imagine that the windows in this courtroom were completely covered by heavy drapes, all of the windows, so that you could not see outside, you couldn't even tell whether it was day, or night, or what the conditions were outside. I want you to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Charge

further imagine that it was a bright, sunny day when you entered the courthouse. And now, the doors at the back of the courtroom open, and a person walks in with an umbrella, and it appears to be wet or dripping. And a few minutes later, a second person comes into the courtroom wearing a raincoat and perhaps brushing off drops from the shoulder.

From that combination of facts -- remember, you can't look out the window in my hypothetical, it's all covered over. On that combination of facts, it would be reasonable for you to infer that it had been raining. That's all there is to circumstantial evidence. You assume -- not assume, you infer, on the basis of reason, and experience, and common sense from one established fact, the existence or nonexistence of some other fact. So, it's an inference based on reason, experience and common sense, and the evidence in the case, the existence or nonexistence of some other fact.

Circumstantial evidence is of no less value than direct evidence. The law makes no distinction between direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. It simply requires that your verdict must be based on all the evidence.

You have had the opportunity to observe all the witnesses. It's now your job to decide how believable each witness was in his or her testimony. You are the sole judges of the credibility of each witness and of the importance of his or her testimony.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You should carefully scrutinize all of the testimony of each witness, the circumstances under which each witness testified, the impression the witness made when testifying, and any other matter in evidence that may help you decide the truth and the importance of each witness' testimony.

In other words, in assessing credibility, you may size up a witness in light of his or her demeanor, the explanations given, and all the other evidence in the case. In making your credibility determinations, use your common sense, your good judgment, and your everyday experiences in life.

If you believe that a witness knowingly testified falsely concerning any important matter, whether at trial or in a prior proceeding, you may distrust the witness' testimony concerning other matters. You may reject all of the testimony or you may accept such parts of the testimony that you believe are true and give it such weight as you think it deserves.

In deciding whether to believe a witness, you may take account of any evidence of hostility or affection that the witness may have towards the defendant or the government. may consider any evidence that a witness may benefit in some way from the outcome of the case, and any loyalty, incentive, or motive that might cause the witness to shade the truth. You should carefully scrutinize all of the testimony of each witness, the circumstances under which each witness testified, and any other matter in evidence that may help you decide the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

truth and importance of each witness' testimony.

In deciding whether or not a witness was truthful, you may ask yourself: How did the witness appear? Was the witness candid, frank, and forthright, or did the witness seem evasive or suspect in some way? How did the way the witness testified on direct examination compare with how the witness testified on cross-examination? Was the witness consistent or contradictory? Did the witness appear to know what he or she was talking about? Did the witness have the opportunity to observe the facts he or she testified about?

It is your duty to consider whether the witness has permitted any bias or interest to color his or her testimony. In short, if you find that a witness is biased, you should view his or her testimony with caution, weigh it with care, and subject it to close and searching scrutiny.

Of course, the mere fact that a witness is interested in the outcome of the case does not mean that he or she has not told the truth. It is for you to decide, from your observations and applying your common sense, and experience, and all the other considerations mentioned, whether the possible interest of any witness has intentionally or otherwise colored or distorted his or her testimony. You are not required to disbelieve an interested witness. You may accept as much of his or her testimony as you deem reliable and reject as much as you deem unworthy of acceptance.

KSDKBKI

You have heard testimony of law enforcement officers and government employees. The fact that a witness may be employed by the federal, state, or local government as a law enforcement officer or government employee does not mean that his or her testimony is deserving of more or less consideration or greater or lesser weight than that of an ordinary witness. It is fair for you to consider whether the testimony of a law enforcement witness has been colored by a personal or professional bias or interest in the outcome of the case.

It is your decision, after reviewing all the evidence, whether to accept the testimony of the law enforcement witnesses and to give that testimony whatever weight, if any, you find it deserves.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited by showing that the witness testified inconsistently concerning a material matter, or by evidence that at some other time the witness said or did something, or failed to say or do something, which is inconsistent with the testimony the witness gave at trial.

Evidence of a prior inconsistent statement may not be considered by you as affirmative evidence of the fact asserted in the statement or the defendant's guilt. Evidence of the prior inconsistent statement was placed before you for the more limited purpose of helping you decide whether to believe the trial testimony of the witness who is said to have contradicted

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

himself or herself. If you find that the witness made an earlier statement that conflicts with his or her trial testimony, you may consider that fact in deciding how much of his or her trial testimony, if any, to believe. If you believe that a witness has been discredited in this manner, it is exclusively your right to give the testimony of that witness whatever weight you think it deserves.

In making this determination, you may consider whether the witness purposely made a false statement or whether it was an innocent mistake; whether the inconsistency concerns an important fact or whether it had to do with a small detail; whether the witness had an explanation for the inconsistency; and whether the explanation appealed to your common sense.

You have heard evidence of certain statements made by the defendant to the FBI. Ultimately, you are to give the statements such weight, if any, as you feel they deserve in light of all the circumstances.

You have heard recordings of the defendant's postarrest statement. In these recordings, only Mr. Bright's statements are evidence. The statements and questions of the FBI agents are not evidence.

Among the exhibits in evidence, some documents are redacted. "Redacted" means that part of the document was You are to concern yourself only with the part of the item that has been admitted into evidence. You should not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consider any possible reason why the other part has been covered.

In this case, you've heard evidence in the form of a stipulation of fact, or one or more of these stipulations of fact. A stipulation of fact, as I told you, is an agreement between the parties that a certain fact is true. You must regard such agreed-upon facts as true. The weight or importance of the fact is a matter for you, the jury, to decide.

You have heard testimony about evidence seized or obtained in connection with certain searches conducted by law enforcement officers, or otherwise obtained by law enforcement. Evidence obtained by law enforcement was properly admitted in this case and may be properly considered by you. Such searches were appropriate law enforcement actions.

Whether you approve or disapprove of how this evidence was obtained should not enter into your deliberations because I now instruct you that the government's use of this evidence is entirely lawful. You must, therefore, regardless of your personal opinions, give this evidence full consideration along with all the other evidence in the case in determining whether the government has proved the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

There is no legal requirement that law enforcement agents investigate crimes in a particular way or that the

Charge

government prove its case through any particular means. While you are to carefully consider the law enforcement evidence introduced by the government, you are not to speculate as to why they used the techniques they did or why they did not use other techniques. The government is not on trial. Law enforcement techniques are not your concern.

Your concern is to determine whether, on the evidence or lack of evidence, the government has proven Defendant's guilt by proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

You have heard evidence during the course of this trial that this case arose from a so-called undercover operation by law enforcement. The government is permitted to rely on such investigative techniques. Any opinions you may have about the use of an undercover agent should not enter into your deliberations in any way.

You have heard testimony from what we call an expert witness. An expert is a witness who, by education or experience, has acquired learning or experience in a specialized area of knowledge. Such witnesses are permitted to give testimony as to relevant matters in which they profess to be an expert and give their reasons for their opinions. Expert testimony is presented to you on the theory that someone who is experienced in a specialized field can assist you in understanding the evidence or in reaching an independent decision on the facts.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your role in judging credibility applies to experts as well as to other witnesses. You should consider the expert testimony which was received in evidence in the case and give it as much or as little weight as you think it deserves.

If you should decide the testimony of an expert was not based on sufficient education or experience or on sufficient data, or if you should conclude that the trustworthiness or credibility of an expert is questionable for any reason, or if the testimony of the expert was outweighed, in your judgment, by other evidence in the case, then you might disregard the testimony of the expert entirely or in part.

On the other hand, if you find the testimony of an expert is based on sufficient data, education, and experience, and the other evidence does not give you reason to doubt his or her conclusions, you would be justified in placing reliance on his or her testimony.

The government has offered evidence that on different occasions, the defendant may have engaged in conduct similar to certain of the matters charged in the indictment. Let me remind you that the defendant is not on trial for committing acts that are not alleged in the indictment. Accordingly, you may not consider the evidence of the defendant's prior conduct as a substitute for proof that the defendant committed the crime charged. Nor may you consider this evidence as proof that the defendant has a criminal personality or bad character.

Charge

The evidence of the other similar acts was admitted for a much more limited purpose, as I instructed you at the time that evidence was admitted, and you may consider it only for that limited purpose.

If you determine that the defendant committed the acts charged in the indictment and the prior conduct as well, then you may, but need not draw an inference that in doing the acts charged in the indictment, the defendant acted knowingly and intentionally and not because of some mistake, accident, or innocent reasons. Evidence of the prior acts may not be considered by you for any other purpose. Specifically, you may not use this prior act evidence to conclude that defendant committed the -- that because the defendant committed the other act or acts, he must also have committed the act charged in the indictment.

Now, the prior acts weren't necessarily similar, nor were they crimes, but they, according to the government's view of the evidence, bear on the defendant's intent at the time of the crime charged in the indictment.

The defendant, in a criminal case, never has any duty to testify or to come forward with any evidence. That is because, as I have instructed you, the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt remains with the government at all times, and the defendant is presumed innocent, and he is never required to prove that he is innocent. He's presumed innocent. In this

Charge

case, the defendant did testify, and he was subject to cross-examination, like any other witness. You should examine and evaluate his testimony just as you would the testimony of any witness.

I instruct you that anything you may have seen or heard about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. Indeed, as I have instructed you throughout this case, you may not read, view, or listen to any media or press reports or internet or social media postings about this case or about the people or issues referred to during the trial. Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence or lack of evidence that came out in this courtroom and the Court's instructions on the law.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in standing up and stretching.

Are we okay?

JURY MEMBERS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, good.

Let me turn to the substantive law to be applied in this case.

The defendant, Peter Bright, has been formally charged in what is called an indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is no more than the means by which a criminal case is started. It is not evidence. It's not proof of the defendant's guilt. It creates no presumption, and it permits

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

no inference that a defendant is quilty. You are to give no weight to the fact that an indictment has been returned against the defendant.

You will have in the jury room a copy of the indictment. I will first summarize the offense charged and then explain in detail the elements of the offense.

The indictment charges that from on or about April 18, 2019, up to and including on or about May 22, 2019, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, the defendant willfully and knowingly used a facility and means of interstate and foreign commerce to persuade, induce, entice, and coerce an individual who had not attained the age of 18 to engage in sexual activity for which a person can be charged with a criminal offense, and attempted to do the same; namely, that the defendant used computers and/or telephones to communicate with an undercover FBI agent about arranging to engage in sexual activity with a purported nine-year-old boy and seven-year-old girl, and attempted to meet with the boy and girl to engage in sexual activity, in violation of New York Penal Law. Before you begin your deliberations, I'll provide you with a copy of the indictment.

Mr. Bright has entered a plea of not guilty and is presumed innocent of the charge. In order for you to convict, it is necessary for you to find the government has proven each and every element of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

K3DKBRT5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will now give you more detailed instructions.

To sustain its burden of proof with respect to the charge of attempting to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce a minor under 18 years of age to engage in illegal sexual activity, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following four elements:

First, that the defendant knowingly used a facility or means of interstate commerce. And this is the overview. going to go into these elements in greater detail in a moment. So that's the first element.

Second: That the defendant knowingly persuaded, induced, enticed, or coerced an individual to engage in sexual activity, or attempted to do so;

Third, that the sexual activity would violate New York State law;

And, fourth, that the individual was less than 18 years old at the time of the acts alleged in the indictment or that the defendant believed the individual was less than 18 years old.

The first element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant used a facility of interstate or foreign commerce, as alleged in the indictment. Transmission of communications by means of a telephone or the internet constitutes the use of facility of interstate commerce regardless of whether the communication

Charge

actually crossed state lines. However, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the specific communication in question was actually transmitted by means of a telephone or the internet.

The second element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant knowingly persuaded, induced, enticed, or coerced someone to engage in sexual activity, or that he attempted to do so.

The government does not have to prove that the defendant communicated directly with the person. Communication with a third party whose role was to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce the person is sufficient to establish this element.

To act knowingly is to act voluntarily and purposely and not by mistake or accident. The terms persuade, induce, entice, or coerce are words of common usage, and you should apply their common or everyday meaning to the evidence in this case.

Now, science has not yet devised a means or manner of looking into a person's mind and knowing what that person is thinking. Rarely is direct proof of state of mind available, and direct proof is not required. However, you do have before you evidence of certain alleged acts that are alleged to have taken place and certain physical evidence that can help you infer what was going on in someone's mind.

Any one of these terms - persuade, induce, entice, or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

coerce - suffices for the purposes of the statute provided that all the other elements of the crime are also proven. does not require that any "sexual activity" actually occur if a person knowingly persuaded, induces, entices, or coerces a person to engage in any sexual activity. For example, one could knowingly entice a person to eat a piece of chocolate candy even though the person never eats the candy.

Mere intention to commit a specific crime does not amount to an attempt. In order to establish this second element, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant intended to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce a minor to engage in a sexual act;

And, second, that the defendant willfully took some action that was a substantial step in an effort to bring about or accomplish the crime.

In determining whether the defendant's actions amounted to a substantial step towards the commission of the crime, you must distinguish between mere preparation, on the one hand, and the actual doing of the criminal deed on the other. Mere preparation may consist of planning the offense or devising, obtaining, or arranging the means for its commission, and, without more, that is not an attempt, although some preparations may amount to an attempt.

A substantial step must be something more than mere preparation, yet may be less than the last act necessary before

commit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the actual commission of the crime. The act or acts must strongly show the firmness of the defendant's intent to commit the actual crime. Whether the specific conduct constitutes a substantial step depends on the particular facts of the case viewed in the light of the crime charged. There is no requirement that the attempt be successful or that the defendant actually have carried out the crime he was trying to

The third element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that this sexual activity, if completed, would violate New York law. The indictment alleges that the defendant attempted to persuade a person to engage in sexual activity in violation of New York Penal Law, rape in the third degree; rape in the second degree; rape in the first degree; sexual abuse in the third degree; sexual abuse in the second degree; and sexual abuse in the first degree.

A person commits rape in the third degree when he or she engages in sexual intercourse with another person, the other person is less than 17 years old, and the actor is 21 years old or older.

A person commits rape in the second degree when he or she engages in sexual intercourse with another person, the other person is less than 15 years old, and the actor is 18 years old or older.

A person commits rape in the first degree when he or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

she engages in sexual intercourse with a person who is less than 11 years old.

A person commits sexual abuse in the third degree when he or she subjects another person to sexual contact without the other person's consent.

A person commits sexual abuse in the second degree when he or she subjects another person to sexual contact, and the other person is less than 14 years old.

A person commits sexual abuse in the first degree when he or she subjects another person to sexual contact, and the other person is less than 11 years old. A person also commits sexual abuse in the first degree when he or she subjects another person to sexual contact, the other person is less than 13 years old, and the actor is 21 years old or older.

Sexual contact, under New York law, means any touching of the sexual or other intimate parts of a person for the purpose of gratifying the sexual desire of either party. It includes the touching of the actor by the victim, as well as the touching of the victim by the actor, whether directly or through clothing, as well as the emission of ejaculate by the actor upon any part of the victim, clothed or unclothed.

Under New York State law, sexual intercourse has its ordinary meaning and occurs upon any penetration, however slight.

Under New York State law, for a sexual act to be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

criminal, it must be committed without the consent of the victim. Under New York law, lack of consent can result from an incapacity to consent. A person is deemed incapable of consent under New York law when he or she is less than 17 years old.

Now, I've indicated to you a number of crimes in violation of New York Penal Law, and I gave you the names of those crimes. You must all be in agreement as to one of those. In other words, it can't be that half of you consider it one crime and half of you consider it another crime; all jurors must be in unanimous agreement that one of those crimes was the object here. All right?

The final element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the person was actually under the age of 18 or that the defendant believed the person was under the age of 18. It is not a defense to the charge that the person was not in fact under 18 years old, as long as the defendant believed him or her to be under 18 years old.

In addition to all the other elements I've described, you must consider the issue of venue. Venue is whether any act in furtherance of the crime charged occurred within the Southern District of New York. The Southern District of New York includes Manhattan, the Bronx, and Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Dutchess, Orange and Sullivan Counties and the bodies of water and bridges over bodies of water within the boundaries of Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The government does not need to prove the crime was committed in the Southern District of New York or that the defendant was present here. It is sufficient that any act in furtherance of the crime charged occurred here.

Unlike the other elements of the crime charged, the government need only prove venue by a preponderance of the evidence, and not beyond a reasonable doubt. A preponderance of the evidence means that it is more likely than not that any act in furtherance of the crime occurred in the Southern District of New York.

If you find that the government failed to prove the venue requirement by a preponderance of the evidence, then you must find the defendant not quilty.

You will note that the indictment alleges that certain acts occurred on or about various dates. It is not essential that the government prove that the defendant attempted to entice a child on these particular dates. The law requires only a substantial similarity between the dates alleged in the indictment and the dates established by the evidence.

The defense contends that Mr. Bright never intended to entice an actual seven-year-old and/or nine-year-old to engage in illegal sexual activity. The defense contends that Mr. Bright believed that he and the undercover agent were engaged in age-based role play, or age play, until the agent sent Mr. Bright photographs of what appeared to be children.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The defense contends that Mr. Bright met with the undercover agent with the intent to gather evidence to report her to law enforcement, not with the intent to engage in illegal sexual activity with the purported children.

The possible punishment of a defendant in the event of conviction is not a proper consideration for the jury, and should not, in any way, enter into or influence your deliberations. The duty of imposing sentence is on the Court and the Court alone. Your function is to weigh the evidence and determine whether the defendant is or is not quilty on the basis of evidence and the law. Therefore, I instruct you not to consider possible punishment in any way in your deliberations in this case.

I will allow the exhibits received into evidence to go with you into the jury room.

If you want to hear the recordings, send out a note, tell me which recording you want to hear, be as specific as possible, and we'll play that recording in the courtroom.

If there's some testimony that you want to hear or read back, you may ask for that testimony. Please be as specific as possible in the event you request to have testimony read back. Your request for testimony -- in fact, any communication with the Court -- should be made in writing, signed by your foreperson, and given to the deputy marshal outside your jury room.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In any event, do not tell me or anyone else what the vote is in the jury room until after a unanimous verdict is reached.

Some of you have taken notes periodically throughout the trial. Notes that any of you have made may not be given any greater weight or influence in determination of the case than the recollections or impressions of other jurors, whether from notes or memory, with respect to the evidence presented or what conclusions, if any, should be drawn from such evidence. Any difference between a juror's recollection and another juror's notes should be settled by asking to have the court reporter read back the transcript, for it is the court record rather than any juror's note upon which the jury must base its determination of the facts and verdict.

In a few moments, you will retire to decide the case. It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement. Each of you must decide the case for himself or herself, but you should do so only after a consideration of the case with your fellow jurors, and you should not hesitate to change an opinion when convinced that it is erroneous. Your verdict must be unanimous, but you're not bound to surrender your conscientiously held beliefs concerning the effect or weight of the evidence for the mere purpose of returning a verdict solely because of the opinion of other jurors. Discuss and weigh your

Charge

respective opinions dispassionately, without regard to sympathy, without regard to prejudice or favor for either party, and adopt the conclusion that in your good conscience appears to be in accordance with the evidence and the Court's instructions on the law.

Please remember, you are not partisans; you are judges - judges of the facts - not representatives of a constituency or cause.

If at any point you find yourselves divided, do not inform the Court of what the vote is. Once you have reached the verdict, do not announce what the verdict is until I ask you to do so in the courtroom.

Once you get in the jury room, you must select a foreperson who will be responsible for signing all communications to the Court on behalf of the jury and for handing them to the deputy marshal. This should not be understood to mean that an individual cannot send the Court a note should the foreperson refuse to do so.

There is a verdict form for you to use and to record your decisions. I'll have multiple copies sent in, but only one copy gets signed to record your verdict. And that's signed by your foreperson and dated.

And we'll give you an envelope --

24 | Flo?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: They have it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- that you can put the verdict form or any note in. And in that note, or when you tell the deputy marshal that you've reached a verdict and you've put it in the envelope, do not say what the verdict is. The Court will call you back into the courtroom for the verdict to be read aloud in open court.

I will stress that each of you must be in agreement with the verdict that is announced. Once your verdict is announced by your foreperson in open court and officially recorded, it cannot ordinarily be revoked.

Your function now is to weigh the evidence in this case and determine whether the government has or has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt the quilt of defendant Peter Bright with respect to the count in the indictment.

You must base your verdict solely on the evidence or lack of evidence in this case and these instructions as to the law. I am sure that if you listen to the views of your fellow jurors and if you apply your own common sense, you will reach a verdict in accordance with the evidence and the law.

Finally, let me state that your oath sums up your duty, and that is: Without fear or favor to anyone, you will well and truly try the issues based solely upon the evidence or lack of evidence and this Court's instructions as to the law.

Members of the jury, that concludes my instructions. You may stand up and stretch while I confer with the lawyers at

Case 1:19-cr-00521-PKC Document 81 Filed 04/14/20 Page 174 of 180 K3DKBRI5 Charge 1 sidebar. 2 (At the sidebar) 3 THE COURT: Anything from the government? 4 MR. LI: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Anything from the defendant? 6 MS. BAHARANYI: No, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 Thank you. I'm going to instruct the alternates that 9 they're still on jury duty. They have to follow the 10 instructions that that I gave at the outset of the case, and 11 that they're subjected to recall. Okay? COUNSEL: Thank you, Judge. 12 13 THE COURT: And I've marked as Exhibit 3 the final 14 typed text of the instructions. 15 MR. LI: Yes, your Honor. 16 (In open court) 17 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, can you please raise your hand: Juror No. 13, Juror No. 14, Juror No. 15, 18 19 Juror No. 16, Juror No. 17, and Juror No. 18. 20 You may put your hands down.

21

22

23

24

25

If you think I'm going to tell you that you're no longer on jury duty, that's not the case. Under the rules, you are still on jury duty but you may leave now, and you may resume your ordinary life. You must continue to follow my instructions, which I gave you at the outset, and all of those

Charge

instructions, including: Do not discuss the case among yourselves or with anybody. All right? That still applies to you. Do not do any research, because you are subject to being recalled in this case, and you will be asked, under oath, whether you complied with those instructions.

The one promise I have for you is that once a verdict

The one promise I have for you is that once a verdict is reached or the jury is discharged in this case, we will call you and let you know what happened. That, I promise you, and, that way, you will know that you're now released of your obligation.

I stand in awe, I sit in awe. I am so impressed with this jury and how conscientious you all are. I wish the rest of our citizens could see how dedicated all of you have been to your service.

At this point, we all will stand as these six jurors exit the courtroom in honor of you.

You can leave your notebooks in the jury room, please.

(Alternates excused)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Mr. Deputy, if you'd please come forward for the administration of the oath.

(Marshal sworn)

THE COURT: Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is what we're going to do: You have more flexibility as a deliberating juror in terms of your time schedule. If I hear nothing from

Cha	rge
-----	-----

And if you would like -- when I say "if you would like," I assume you would like -- a car service to your home, we will endeavor to work a car service to your home. There may be some possibility that it might be to, for example, Grand Central if you're taking a train, but I'm trying to get it so that it would be to your home. That's perfectly up to you, whether you want to do that or not, but that would enable you to stay a bit later, within reason. All right?

Ladies and gentlemen, you may now discuss the case among yourselves.

Mr. Deputy, see that the alternate jurors are out.

MARSHAL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you'll stay there until they exit, please.

(The jury retired to deliberate at 3:37 p.m.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

I say what I had said at the first trial: The lawyering in this case was exceptionally excellent, professional. The lawyers in this case acted the way members of the Southern District bar should act - professional,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Charge

courteous to one another, compliant with the judge's instructions. In that sense, it was a dream trial to preside over, and that's saying something when it's a retrial. No trial is a dream if it's a retrial because neither side wants to do it twice, but I very much appreciate it.

As you know, it is my job to do what I do, and I make no apology for that -- that's what I do -- but you certainly all facilitated this case being presented to the jury in an effective manner and in a timely manner. So, you should be very proud of that.

I follow the eight-minute rule, which is you have to be in a position where we can get you back in the courtroom within eight minutes of a note coming back. So, that means you can't go back to your offices; you have to be reachable, and I think particularly for the balance of the afternoon, until we know what the jury wants to do on timing, it's a good idea to stay close.

Thank you very much.

MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor.

(Recess pending verdict)

21

22

23

24

25

1 (Trial resumed at 5:06 p.m.; jury not present) 2 THE COURT: All right. I have a note from the jury, 3 which we'll have marked as Court Exhibit 5. I don't know if I 4 have the verdict sheet, which should be marked as Court Exhibit 5 4. Do we have the verdict sheet? 6 7 DEPUTY CLERK: I have it downstairs. They were in the 8 jury room. 9 THE COURT: Okay. The note will be marked as Court 10 Exhibit 5, which says: "We're done for the day. We will 11 return on Monday." 12 And the name of the foreperson is illegible to me. 13 Bring our jurors in, please. 14 We'll mark the indictment as 6, I guess. Here's the indictment. 15 16 (Jury present) 17 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. 18 Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. 19 Will the foreperson please identify themself? 20 All right. Excellent, Juror No. 3. 21 So we have your note. And I'm just calling you in to 22 wish you well for the weekend and to remind you of a few 23 things. The case is now at a very sensitive stage. When I say 24 do not discuss the case with anyone, you're going to be home

with your family this weekend. You, as jurors, are the only

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ones who have sat through this trial and heard the testimony and know the evidence. No matter how much you respect or care for another loved one or a spouse or significant other, they were not here. Their opinions are not worth anything. If you had a family member or close friend who was involved in this case, either at the front table or at the second table, you would want jurors who followed the judge's instructions not to do research, not to do your own investigation, not to talk to anyone. So please remember that and live up to your oaths. You're wonderful jurors, and I know you will.

And we'll see you at 10:00 o'clock on Monday morning, as usual. And when you come in, flip the light on so that we know that all 12 of you have arrived. Do not begin discussing the case until the last juror has arrived. You can't begin before that. All right?

And my personal advice to you is when you walk out of the building, take a deep breath and let it go for the weekend. Put it out of your thinking. Monday will be here soon enough, all right? So put it out of your mind. You have enough other things to think about, including laundry, and groceries, and healthcare, and families, and plenty of things on your mind. No baseball, no basketball, but you'll have other things, I And we'll see you for a prompt start on Monday morning.

Have a wonderful peaceful weekend. See you then.

(Jury not present)

```
K3DKBRI5
                                Charge
1
               THE COURT: And the advice I gave the jury goes for
2
      all the trial participants as well.
3
               Have a good weekend.
 4
               MR. LI: Thank you, your Honor.
5
               MR. MAIMIN: Thank you, your Honor.
6
               MS. BAHARANYI: Have a good weekend.
 7
               (Adjourned to March 16, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.)
                                    *****
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```